FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-152-S
Wednesday
9 August 1989

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT
Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-152-S *9 August 1989*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: The Daily Report is publishing the full translation of IZVESTIYA's "stenographic record" of the Congress of People's Deputies. Additional supplements will be issued as translated material becomes available.

STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

Gorbachev Adjourns 5 Jun Congress Session *[IZVESTIYA 6 Jun]* 1
Congress Proceedings Continue 6 Jun *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jun]* 2

Gorbachev Adjourns 5 Jun Congress Session

PM0606142189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
6 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 2

["USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Stenographic Record."—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text]

Tenth Session

5 June 1989. Kremlin Palace of Congresses. 1000.

M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in the chair.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade deputies! As you know, on the night of 3-4 June a major accident occurred at a liquefied gas pipeline near the Chelyabinsk-Ufa Railroad, on the territory of the Bashkirian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, near the border of Chelyabinsk Oblast. A large number of people were killed in the accident. According to preliminary figures, the number is several hundred people. They include a group of children en route to a vacation in the south.

I propose that our congress observe a minute's silence in memory of the deceased. (All rise).

I propose on behalf of the congress that we express our profound condolences to the families, relatives, and friends of those killed in the accident.

Yesterday Comrade Ryzhkov and I flew to the scene of the accident. From the very first minute local people there had immediately gone to aid the victims. It is a remote spot, far from any large settlements. The largest population center—the town of Asha in Chelyabinsk Oblast—is 15 km away. The local population, seeing and hearing that something had happened, went to the scene of the explosion. When they saw everything, they passed on information about what had happened, to Ufa, rayon centers, and Chelyabinsk. The local population were rescuing people all night. Literally in the first few minutes and hours 100 first-aid teams traveled out from Ufa. It is difficult to know how many people are still alive. Yesterday, when we were on the scene, there were more than 580 people alive, but many of them were in serious condition. Several people died yesterday.

It is a great tragedy—even hard to imagine. The pipeline is a kilometer away from the railroad. We went there and had a look. You still cannot approach the area, fires are still burning—the gas is being burned off. Clearly, the pipeline had been holed in the area where the burning continues. The gas itself drifted down the slope to the railroad. Since the weather had been warm recently the gas built up and filled the hollow. There was clearly a massive buildup of explosive material. Consequently, the explosion was so terrible that the forest and everything else was instantly destroyed over a large area. The rails were twisted. In general, the people were involved in a disaster so terrible that it is hard even to contemplate.

It happened at 0200 local time. Most people were asleep, but some of them witnessed what happened. There were several dozen people who received immediate first aid and were able to talk. They talked about everything that happened.

I do not intend now to judge the causes, so as not to preempt the conclusions of the government commission and investigative organs, which are now on the spot and have started work. But a drop in pressure in the pipeline was discovered at 2000 Moscow time—3 hours before the events happened. I do not intend to pass judgment on how people should have acted, but common sense suggests that people should have found out what was happening and why. The investigative organs have now taken control of all the equipment which records the parameters of the pipeline's work. But on the basis of initial information—although this too remains to be clarified—the personnel switched on the pumps to boost pressure without investigating what was happening. Clearly they pumped gas into the pipe, it escaped through the leak, and built up in the hollow. And when a lot had built up and risen up to the level of the contact wires, it only needed a spark to set it all off. That's what happened.

What has happened has caused me very great concern. The question is: Why were these two trains there together? As is well known, they were not supposed to meet at that station. In any event, there must be an investigation. We talked with local residents, too. People are saying that everything must be investigated—so as to prevent a recurrence of incompetence, irresponsibility, mismanagement, and scandal. Things will not work in our country if carelessness leads to such human tragedies, not to mention the economic consequences.

The commission is at work now. Doctors headed by Comrade Chazov are there. All the country's major burns-treatment centers have been mobilized, the leading specialists have been mobilized, and they are all working there. People are donating blood. Generally speaking people are doing all they can, but the situation is very difficult. We must draw very rigorous lessons from this.

Before flying out there yesterday we consulted with comrades from the Politburo and agreed that they should go around to the hotels and inform the deputies. During these conversations many people expressed the wish that all deputies, out of a sense of charity, should donate their day's pay to a charity fund for the families involved. Of course you cannot replace relatives or children, but you must be beside people. I think that we will respond to that.

Here is another point. We have declared today a day of mourning. Our opinion is that today should be a recess. There will be a session of the congress at 1000 hours tomorrow and a session of the Soviet of Nationalities at 1600 hours. But the time available today could be used by deputies to go to the government, the Central Committee, and the ministries with their unresolved questions or, conversely, to check on how questions are being resolved.

I think that we should do that. Agreed, comrades?

From the floor: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: Then I will wind things up here. But we have an appeal from a group of deputies. There is concern at the situation in Fergana and Nagorno-Karabakh, and a group of deputies asks that this letter be read out on behalf of the congress: "We, people's deputies of the USSR, urge those who have been taking part in interethnic clashes to heed the voice of reason and stop the bloodshed. Injustices and problems have accumulated in interethnic relations and were ignored for years, but that does not mean that painful issues cannot be resolved in principle. A knot of problems cannot be unraveled by mutual confrontations. Think about those innocent people against whom the hand has been raised, think about the women, children, and old people. Stay that hand, prevent the injustices. We urge you to resolve the problems that have occurred by peaceful means, by means of the law." There is a large group of deputies from Leningrad, Moscow, and the Baltic region here.

I would support this appeal from our congress. This worries us all. We all feel it: This theme is at the center of our discussion and we are looking now for ways to resolve these questions in the future. Well, comrades? Shall we publish this? People are listening to us and, I think, will heed our voice and our appeal for reason. We will publish this appeal on behalf of the congress.

At this point we take our leave of one another today.

Congress Proceedings Continue 6 Jun

PM0806115389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
8 Jun 89 Morning Edition pp 1-6

["USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Stenographic Record."—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text]

Tenth Session

6 June 1989. Kremlin Palace of Congresses. 1000.

USSR People's Deputy A.V. Gorbunov in the chair.

A.V. Gorbunov: Comrade deputies! Our congress is now back in session. Allow me to announce the deputy registration results for the morning session of 6 June. Two thousand one hundred nineteen deputies registered.

We are continuing discussión of the issue "On the Basic Directions of the USSR's Foreign and Domestic Policy." In keeping with our tradition, there has been a motion to announce the agenda for the morning session and to list the speakers designated by the Presidium of our congress: Dadamyan, general director of the Stepanakert Motor Transport Production Association, Nagorno-Karabakh; Sokolov, chairman of the executive committee of the Gorkiy Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies; Khallik, lead scientific associate of the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Academy of Sciences; Mongo, director of the department for affairs of nationalities of the north and the Arctic of the Krasnoyarsk Kray Executive Committee; Kasyan, division director of the Leshchinovskiy Boarding School, Poltava Oblast; Minnullin, chairman of the board of the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] Writers Union; Seleznev, first secretary of the Kursk Oblast CPSU Committee; Kugultinov, writer, chairman of the board of the Kalmyk ASSR Writers Union; Lizichev, chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy; Alekseyev, director of the Institute of Philosophy and Law; Rasputin, writer; Yarovoy, director of the Dvigatel Production Association, city of Tallinn; Sharik, first secretary of the Amur Oblast CPSU Committee; Borovik, writer, chairman of the Soviet Peace Committee; Lavrov, performer from the Gorkiy Leningrad Theater, chairman of the board of the USSR Union of Theater Officials; Arbatov, academician, director of the Institute of the USA and Canada of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Bykov, art director of the Yunost and Mosfilm associations, secretary of the board of the USSR Union of Cinematographers; Suleymenov, writer, first secretary of the board of the Kazakhstan Writers Union; Ugarov, artist, president of the USSR Artists Academy.

Such is the agenda planned by the presidium for our morning session and for the entire day of our work here together.

The floor is given to Comrade Boris Vartanovich Dadamyan....

Ye.A. Gayer, scientific associate of the Institute of History, Archeology, and Ethnography of the Far Eastern Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Vladivostok (Far Eastern National-Territorial Election District, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]): I have been waiting for a chance to speak for 3 days. I was told on Thursday [1 June] that you would give me an opportunity to speak, on Friday I was told I would be given an opportunity to speak, and today I was told the same thing. My name does not appear on the list today. What is going on? Could you please explain? For the first time in the country's history I was selected as a

representative of an indigenous people to the USSR Supreme Soviet, and I am unable to get the floor in order to say something. I ask for the floor today.

A.V. Gorbunov: Respected colleague, please come up here to the presidium during the break. And so, the floor is given to Comrade Dadamyan. Comrade Sokolov, prepare yourself.

From the floor: On behalf of 270 agrarian deputies I ask for the floor....

A.V. Gorbunov: Excuse me, comrade colleague deputy, the chair will not yield to you.

B.V. Dadamyan, general director of the Stepanakert Motor Transport Production Association, Stepanakert (Stepanakert National-Territorial Election District, Azerbaijan SSR): Dear comrades! The tragedy in the Bashkir ASSR has shaken the citizens of Karabakh, the pain it has caused in our hearts is a familiar one. Together with the entire country we mourn the death of the many hundreds of losses.

Dear friends! You are not alone in your misfortune and sufferings. Brothers of the same blood are with you throughout the entire union. Faced by terrible misfortune, and stricken by their own recent tragedy, the citizens of Karabakh grieve for the victims, recognize the losses to be irretrievable and irreplaceable, and mourn them. In this grim hour of trial, we wish our suffering brethren courage and patience.

One cannot grieve alone, and it is only in a truly equal, unified family of fraternal peoples, relying on sympathy and support, that we can endure this terrible blow. The people of Karabakh offer their condolences. Let me report that representatives of the benevolent society of Armenia and Karabakh have already left for the place of the tragedy with the R50,000 they collected and 40 boxes of medicine. (Applause).

Respected chairmen, respected deputies! In his speech to the congress, when he spoke about national problems, Mikhail Sergeyevich employed the image of a plow. If we begin to establish lines of demarcation, if we begin marking off our land with a plow, this would mean our destruction. That is all quite true! But let's ask ourselves honestly, who was it that drew the plow over the destiny of the people of Nagorno-Karabakh? On 4 July 1921 a decision was made by the plenum of the Caucasian Bureau of the RKP(b) [Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks)] to incorporate Nagorno-Karabakh (a part of the ancient Armenian land of Artsy) into Soviet Armenia. But on the very next day, at a new session of the Caucasian Bureau, by Stalin's will the Armenian people were divided into two parts, and an area with a 95 percent Armenian population was transferred to the Azerbaijan SSR on the following grounds, and I quote: "...on the basis of the need for national peace between Armenians and Muslims...." Later on a line was drawn between the Armenian and Azerbaijan SSR in such a way that Nagorno-Karabakh did not possess a common border with Armenia. A 5 km sanitation zone was deliberately formed between the two parts of the Armenian people.

Those who drew the lines knew quite well what they wanted! What was behind this? Short-sightedness, or a policy of "divide and conquer"? At any rate they separated, tore apart, and incorporated. What was the result, what followed? What followed was a policy of discrimination against the Armenian population of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and their expulsion from their native land. The leaders of the Azerbaijan SSR changed, and the words and the slogans changed, but this policy remained unchanged. Discrimination encompassed all spheres: economics, jobs, education, culture. The Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast has been transformed into a raw material-supplying appendage of Azerbaijan, and the people have abandoned their land. Today around 3,000 Armenians—Karabakh emigrants who had been forced to move away—reside outside Nagorno-Karabakh. In the period from 1970 to 1979 only one out of every 10 Armenians born here stayed in Nagorno-Karabakh; the rest were forced to migrate. Any attempt to establish cultural and spiritual ties with Armenia were brutally suppressed. An attempt was made to take away not only the future of the Armenians, but also their past.

The "history of Armenia" was expunged from Armenian schools. Ancient monuments of Armenian culture and architecture—stone witnesses to our people's ownership of our land—were destroyed and defamed. Even the ancient Armenian khachkary—stone crosses—were proclaimed to be monuments of Azerbaijani ancestors. Things went so far that Armenians began to be persuaded that they were not at all Armenians, but Armenianized Albanians. There was but one goal to such historical and ideological aggression—to prove that the Armenians were immigrants, that they were foreigners on this land.

It has not been a day or two, but decades that the national worth of Karabakh Armenians has been scorned. And the national peace promised by the Caucasian Bureau is nonexistent. The tragic fate of Nakhichevan is an example for Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh to see. At the demand of Turkey and in compliance with a treaty signed in 1921 between Russia and Turkey, this ancient Armenian land was transferred to Azerbaijan, which administered it in its own way. Today there are practically no Armenians in this autonomous republic, which is located entirely on Armenian territory sharing no borders with Azerbaijan but contained within it. The idea of a national liberation movement dominated the thoughts of Karabakh Armenians throughout all of these decades. The people of the NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] rose against national oppression several times. But all uprisings were brutally crushed.

Restructuring generated hope. Expressing the will of its people, in February 1988 the oblast soviet of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast appealed to the supreme soviets of the Azerbaijan and Armenian SSRs and to the USSR Supreme Soviet with a request to examine and resolve the issue of the reannexation of Nagorno-Karabakh to Armenia. It is the sad truth that whenever complex problems arise, people in our country make decisions that are from the best from the very beginning. Or they follow the golden rule of stagnation—shuffle the problem aside, avoid solving it. And so it was with the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh. When it embarked upon restructuring, the country's leadership knew of course that it would not be able to avoid nationality problems. Difficulties were anticipated. This is precisely why the events in the NKAO were perceived not in and of themselves, in their real essence, but as a dangerous precedent, as a possible threat to restructuring. Hence the first reactions of the authorities were to impose prohibitions, hence the erroneous decision of the Politburo on 21 February 1988, and hence the half-measures in the 18 July decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. These decisions did not account for the complexity and the reality of the situation.

Artificial postponement of the problem's solution sharply aggravated the interethnic situation in the region. It was only following many months that it came to be recognized that the problem exists, and that it arose on the soil of discriminatory, and even inhumane relations, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev so aptly defined them, toward us on the part of the former leadership of Azerbaijan.

Attempts are being made to represent the political problem of Nagorno-Karabakh as an economic problem. Of course, the economy of the NKAO is extremely depressed. And we do favor improvement of the economy, and establishment of regional cost accounting. But the main thing for us is to solve the political problem within the framework of self-determination! The fact that the economy will continue to limp along without a political solution is demonstrated by those R450 million that were allocated by Moscow to the NKAO but which were side-tracked en route in Baku. We have yet to see this money. Moreover, you all know that money ceases to be just paper only after it assumes the form of capital, particularly construction materials and equipment, and the lion's share of this capital should be coming from Baku. It should, but it is not!

The Karabakh movement raised many issues which still remain unresolved. The main thing here is this: Do we recognize Lenin's principle of self- determination of nations? It is our belief, Lenin emphasized, that it would be a betrayal of socialism to deny self-determination of nations under socialism. Today, at the end of the 20th century, contrary to recognized international rules of law and the practice of self-determination of nations, clear and unambiguous expression of the people's will concerning the annexation of Nagorno-Karabakh to Armenia is interpreted as unlawful aspiration for restructuring the borders, as something fundamentally impermissible and asocial.

Should we in Nagorno-Karabakh take this to mean that the party has in fact distanced itself from the principles of self-determination of nations? In his report to the congress Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said: "The principle of national self-determination proposed by Lenin was and remains one of the chief elements of the nationality policy of the Communist Party."

How are the people of Nagorno-Karabakh to interpret these words? As consent to rejoin the two parts of the Armenian people, or as a "Yes, but..." type of political slogan?

Eighty-five percent of us in this hall are Communists, and to a certain degree we represent the face of the party. Let's ask ourselves why, in behalf of what lofty principles must the Armenian people of Karabakh suffer. What sort of self-determination is it when a smaller nation must seek permission for self-determination from a larger nation? The latter may charitably grant permission, or arrogantly refuse. What kind of self-determination is this when it requires the permission of a big power? The time has come to bring our constitution into line with Lenin's conception of self-determination!

Respected deputies! I would like to focus your attention on the practice of selective de-Stalinization. Why is it that as we rid ourselves of Stalin's legacy in other areas of our life, we leave inviolable the arbitrary decisions that were made in regard to the principles and structure of the federated system adopted under pressure from Stalin? The existing status of autonomy, you see, is essentially a semifeudal institution, a means of consolidating a hierarchy of nations! Under these conditions the concept itself of equal nations becomes a fiction!

And now let us move from the proud slogans of self-determination to reality, and consider what Nagorno-Karabakh actually gets in place of self-determination. It received a special form of administration: The power of the oblast soviet of people's deputies, the soviet of labor collectives, and the party oblast committee were curtailed. Local soviet rule was actually abolished. The decision to create a special administrative committee was served up to the public as a compromise which infringed upon no one's interests, as one capable of stabilizing the situation in the region. But this is not so. This special form of administration rests upon a strong military presence, which unfortunately does not keep the leadership of Azerbaijan from pursuing an even more brutal line of discrimination against the Armenian people; the interethnic conflict continues to deepen. Are we cognizant of the fact that in the NKAO, the Azerbaijani leadership is implementing a variant of the "Cypriot model"? The region is split on an ethnic basis into two

opposing communities—this is what the desire to postpone solution of the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh has led to! It was our duty to predict this development of events, rather than instilling fear and making references to "unpredictable consequences."

The crime of Sumgait is a special issue. Without going into it, I would like to note that political assessment of the crime of Sumgait is important not only for the Armenians but also the Azerbaijani people. I would like to assure you on my part that we have no intention of laying blame for this malicious act upon the Azerbaijani people, and we deeply regret that its true instigators and organizers have not yet been revealed.

Concluding my statement, complying with instructions from my constituents I would like to transmit the demands of the Armenian people of Nagorno-Karabakh to the congress. We demand:

First: Immediate restoration of the oblast CPSU committee and oblast executive committee of the NKAO. Return soviet rule to Karabakh soil!

Second: Repeal the 5 July 1921 decision of the Caucasian Bureau as being contrary to law.

Third: Create a commission of the Supreme Soviet to regulate the procedure of the NKAO's reunification.

If you would permit me, I have 2 minutes left, and I would like to read a resolution of the Congress of People's Deputies, a draft of which we propose here.

A.V. Gorbunov: Respected colleague, it is to me that you direct your request if you wish additional time.... Boris Vartanovich requests 2 minutes to read the resolution.

B.V. Dadamyan: "On the Situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast." This is the draft resolution which we propose.

First. Create a deputy commission to comprehensively and objectively study the situation and to prepare a national referendum in the NKAO on the basis of paragraphs 2 and 13, Article 108, and Paragraph 12, Article 73.

In compliance with Paragraph 6, Article 119 of the USSR Constitution, the USSR Supreme Soviet must organize and conduct a referendum in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

Second. Before the referendum is carried out, grant the NKAO special administrative committee powers which would make the oblast directly subordinant to the central government in fact.

Third. Deem it suitable to restore the functions of local government organs.

This document bears the signatures of 33 deputies. I request.... (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: The floor is given over to Deputy Sokolov. Deputy Khallik will speak next.

From the floor: (Inaudible).

A.V. Gorbunov Comrades, please understand me correctly. If each of the 400 who have not spoken all come up to the microphone now and explain the reasons for their desire to speak, we will not make any headway. Therefore I suggest that you come to the presidium table during the break, at 1200, and we will discuss these questions.

A.A. Sokolov, chairman of the executive committee of the Gorkiy Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies (Sergachskiy Territorial Election District, Gorkiy): Comrade deputies! The discussion that has evolved at the congress shows that there are many problems in our country, in society, and in each republic and territory that trouble the people and require immediate solution. But no matter what the problems might be, not only the supreme organ of power but also the entire system of soviets—from supreme to rural—will play a dominant role in their solution.

During the recent elections we all sensed how strongly the people feel about the issue of their day-to-day life. The people demand that the soviets, which are elected by the people, become the true masters of their territory, and that the abnormal situation when bureaucracies play the main role in resolving many important issues affecting local interests be forever abolished. However, despite the decisions and appeals, the power of the soviets is not experiencing any real increase. To make matters worse, now that a number of laws have been enacted, including the "Law on the State Enterprise (Association)," this power has weakened even more. The imperfections and incompleteness of certain articles and provisions of legislative and normative acts adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the government are being capitalized on by a number of enterprises, and especially cooperatives, for the selfish ends of their own collectives; they are one of the reasons for the unjustified increase in wages, for the erosion of inexpensive goods, and for worsening of financial position, as has already been discussed here. In general, as has already been emphasized, the financial status of the soviets, and of the country as a whole, is the main issue, the key issue. Both the elimination of inflation and the financing of all of our programs—the housing, food, and other social programs—depend on its resolution. Therefore I feel that the Supreme Soviet and the new Council of Ministers must examine all of the proposals that have been submitted in cooperation with deputies, and find a solution to this situation at all costs, treating this as a most acute, most fundamental issue.

As far as the Food Program is concerned, our delegation fully supports the proposals of the agrarian deputies, and feels them to be the basis for developing the necessary measures. We feel that we must mothball half of the industrial facilities presently under construction, and transfer the released finances and material resources to the rural areas. We have made such decisions in the oblast, but this has led to obstructionism on the part of a number of departments. The situation regarding provision of goods and services to the public remains tense. The course of the election meetings and the situation we observed during the elections revealed general unrest, a growing lack of confidence in the possibilities for swift and complete satisfaction of the population's demand for consumer goods. The list of scarce goods is not decreasing. Speedy elimination of the deficit is problematic. There are many reasons for this. And one of them is the monopolistic power of the departments which determine what is to be made by a given enterprise in what quantities, without consideration for local interests.

The influence of local soviets on placement of orders for consumer goods and paid services manifests itself only as that of coordinators, statisticians, or critics. I think that the law should define more clearly the role of the soviets in resolution of these issues as well. The right thing to do would be to legalize principles in accordance with which the right to place a state order for the production of goods for local consumption and for paid services would be possessed by kray (oblast) executive committees, while the union ministries would retain the right and responsibility to place a state order for the production of complex household appliances and articles, and to determine technical policy.

We cannot fail to note that questions concerning state discipline and the discipline of deliveries have become secondary in many collectives, taking a back seat to various business deals and to finding the most profitable consumer. All of this has placed material and technical supply of the national economy, and chiefly the construction organizations that are building social facilities, especially in rural areas, in a highly difficult position. Frequently the capital that is allocated never goes beyond the paperwork stage. Let me say in this connection that no matter where our representatives go, they are always confronted by demands to produce more motor vehicles. Is this right? Also in this connection, it seems to me that the transition to wholesale trade in production implements and raw materials is not justified in all places, and it is premature.

I would also like to give my support to the principle stated in the report that developing democracy should in no way lead to a decline of discipline in all of its aspects—state, production, and especially the discipline of the rule of law. A legal state must be based on conscious execution of laws and conscious discipline. This is precisely why questions of discipline, and especially of responsibility, must take priority today both in the legislative and in the executive sphere, and especially in regard to persons who have committed particular deviations.

Comrade deputies! All of us are united by the enormous responsibility before the voters, who presented us with a mandate of trust in us as representatives in the supreme organ of power. And among the issues that must be examined, those of ecology and living conditions are the most urgent. No matter how deplorable it may seem, we must recognize that because of the unchecked monopoly of the ministries and departments, and the government's unrestricted support of them, an intolerable ecological situation has been created in the cities of Gorkiy, Dzerzhinsk, Kstovo, and Balakhna, and the elementary conditions of human habitation are absent. Industry is concentrated in such a way that toxic atmospheric discharges, the anthropogenic load on the environment and its influence exceed permissible limits by three or four times, and in some cases even more. This is especially intolerable, as I have said, in these cities. We believe that we will have to act and find solutions more aggressively in this area, going as far as shutting down certain production operations.

The state of waterways, especially the Oka and Volga, which are city water sources, remains no less acute. Under these conditions we feel that any further filling of Cheboksarskoye reservoir is absolutely impermissible. Our positions, and the positions of the Mari ASSR, are supported by the RSFSR government and an expert commission, but there has not yet been any resolution of the matter. As you can see, the situation is extremely tense. And added to it is the stress being suffered by the citizens of Gorkiy from the consequences that may arise if construction of a nuclear power plant at the outskirts of the city, near which 2 million persons reside, is not halted.

This is why we are not satisfied with Comrade Shcherbin's responses to our requests and proposals as deputies, as was discussed in the speech by Gennadiy Maksimovich Khodyrev. Letters from residents on these issues are sent to the central organs, and there they are forwarded to the oblast, which is then instructed to reply to the writers. What sort of reply can be given if the people responsible for this area are unable to formulate it clearly?

Considering that after Chernobyl the problems of nuclear power engineering trouble not just us alone, we feel that a law on nuclear power engineering that must account for all issues troubling the population, and especially safety issues, should be adopted. At the same time we must emphasize the need for independent economic and ecological expert examination of any decisions and plans that are adopted. There have been too many impermissible mistakes. Just in our oblast I can cite examples of thoughtless development of a number of chemical production operations, and of almost

R200 million wasted on establishing an operation producing laminated welded tubing in Vyksa. And consider the economic and moral harm that has been done by the "theory" of eliminating unpromising villages! This has already been discussed here, but no person has been found to bear the responsibility, no one has been punished, even though many of the authors of this theory are here, and some of them have remodeled themselves into active supporters of restructuring. (Applause). We need to support the proposal to create such an expert commission in the Supreme Soviet.

Or take another matter: The draft law on the basic principles of restructuring management of the economy and of the social sphere in the union republics on the basis of expansion of their sovereign rights, self-government, and self-financing has now been published. In order to increase the power of the soviets, it proposes transferring a number of sectors of the national economy to it—personal services, the housing fund, municipal management, and others. This doubtlessly needs to be done. But this would hardly increase the economic independence of the soviets, since all of these sectors operate at a loss, and they are in a neglected state. And who is going to pay their debts? Who is going to settle accounts on the unfinished and abandoned water, heat, and sewage networks, and for the delays in development of public health, the road network, and passenger transport? We cannot but support comrades who spoke before me on this issue. The citizens of Gorkiy also sense an acute shortage of such facilities. Substantial debts have accumulated, since the citizens of Gorkiy have directed their efforts for many years on industrialization, on attaining victory, on rehabilitating the devastated national economy, and on strengthening the defensive power of our motherland. The citizens of Nizhegorodskiy Rayon did their duty, reconciling themselves to the numerous deprivations. While it occupies a leading place in the country's industrial potential, in terms of social development the oblast's place in the RSFSR is in the fifties. We contribute R4 billion in profit and turnover tax to the union- republic budget, leaving up to 10 percent in our budget. Therefore deductions into local budgets, payments from the profits of enterprises, payments for productive capital and for use of land, labor resources and nature-related enterprises located within the soviet's territory, and the solid standards for these deductions must be established with regard for the state of the local infrastructure and the developmental problems it has accumulated. Deduction standards must be established on the basis of an assessment of an individual's subsistence wage which, incidentally, it would not be bad to determine for the entire country as a whole as well. That is, we need to determine the debt to society and the territory, and we must do this with the active participation of territorial administrative organs.

In this connection the problems of decentralizing the planning of capital construction are especially acute. As before, dictatorship of the ministries and departments persists in this area. We understand that many industrial sectors must enjoy priority in development. They are needed by the country. But we can no longer tolerate the fact that industrial construction is not decreasing in the oblast, and construction organizations do not have enough capacities remaining for facilities of the agro-industrial complex, for housing and for social, cultural, and personal service facilities. Complying with the decisions that have been adopted, in recent years we have been carefully drawing up plans for contracted work, with the assumption that these plans would stand. But they return from Moscow unrecognizable. Russia's special status in relation to a large number of issues has been discussed in this forum. In capital construction such a situation is illegal, and it is felt especially strongly. In contrast to what happens in other republics, union ministries operate in the RSFSR, and union organs draw up the plans. And I must say frankly that in such a situation the influence of territorial organs is essentially very weak. We need more decisive, clear, and consistent actions. Most difficulties of regional administration stem precisely from the absence of clear economic mutual relations between sectors and territories. We have a special need for strengthening the material and financial base of the lowest organs of government, and of town and village soviets. Under the existing conditions, in which, save for the "symbol" of power and the seal carried in the chairman's pocket, they have neither financial nor material resources, they could hardly ensure integrated economic and social development of their territories. In a word, the principle of self-management, self-financing, cost recovery, and mutual coordination of regional with state interests must be reliably secured in the law. Together with these issues, we need to implement measures to raise the prestige of soviet workers and their equipment support.

And finally. Enough has already been said here on the status of socially unprotected groups of children, especially disabled children, their mothers, and veterans. Supporting the proposal that these issues must be resolved without delay and, in my opinion, right during this congress, I submit a proposal to introduce mandatory deductions from the profit of every enterprise and every cooperative for the improvement of the life of this category of people. I think that for these purposes we also need to establish a maximum wage which, when exceeded, would sharply increase income tax benefiting children and veterans. Emotions are inevitably stirred when one recalls the brilliant speech by soldier-internationalist Deputy Chervonopiskiy, and the statement by Comrade Mazurov. One is compelled to think about how to make things so that there would no longer be any justified reproaches for long waits for housing and for solving other social problems of disabled persons, the families of servicemen killed in action, and of categories of individuals equal to them.

But the real situation is such that after introduction of the Law on the State Enterprise (Association), deductions for these purposes have been halved. Rather than decreasing, the waiting line is growing. The volume of

housing presently being built on the basis of the title lists of local soviets can in no way cover this demand. Then there is the dilapidated housing fund, and the 12 other waiting lines for privileges, besides the usual lines, in which the most poorly paid categories of citizens must stand. In all of this, the soviet stands alone, essentially in a hopeless situation. In my opinion we need to immediately repeal the thoughtless legislative provisions, considering that the 45th anniversary of the victory is approaching. These people defended the entire nation, and the entire nation and all enterprises still owe them a debt. (Applause).

Comrade deputies! There are many acute problems in our life today, and we are talking about them not just to savor them and demonstrate our bankruptcy but to find ways of resolving them. At the same time, the denial of what has been achieved and the besmirching of the past cannot conceal a clear-cut aim of trying to erode socialism and deny the party's leading role. Today's attacks on the party are aimed not at rectifying mistakes but at pooling forces to undermine confidence in the party and its organs and to break its ties with the people. In this respect we do not understand the point of the attacks on Politburo member Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, whom we know as an active worker. Blasphemous words—I cannot call them anything else—have been said here with regard to the Lenin mausoleum and the memory of Vladimir Ilich. (Applause).

Boldly revealing distortions and learning from mistakes, the party is restructuring the political system for the sake of Soviet people and to improve their lives. And I am sure that it will overcome the difficulties in the current period of restructuring. (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: The floor is given to Deputy Khallik. Deputy Mongo, prepare yourself.

K.S. Khallik, lead scientific associate of the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law of the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences, Tallinn (Tallinn-Mustamyaeskiy National-Territorial Election District, Estonian SSR): Respected comrade chairman! Comrade deputies! At this congress, this is the first time after a break of 66 years following the 12th party congress that ethnic relations in our country are being openly discussed. This discussion proves that all of those apprehensions against which Lenin cautioned in his commandments have come to pass. The reasons behind what has occurred have already been named at the congress. They include the flaws of state bureaucratic socialism and the unnatural and antidemocratic nature of the tenacious habits of imperial rule. This system infringes upon the interests of all nations, including the largest in population—the Russian nation.

When restructuring began, neither its principal architects nor the public at large were prepared for the possible advent of national movements. And even today, not everyone perceives them as something inevitable. We experienced this ourselves after the well-known sovereignty declaration of the Estonian Supreme Soviet on 16 November of last year. On one hand there was support from the democratic public, while on the other hand we were labeled with creeping counterrevolution, separatism, nationalism, and antisocialism. The authors of today's document, which has been passed out to the deputies deliberately after the congress actually began its work, appeal for introduction of a special form of government in Estonia. We were told in November: "Why are you pushing your national affairs so? Let's finish restructuring, and then your turn will come." And at the congress we heard appeals such as: "First let's settle the affairs of the state, and then national affairs." But now we have come to understand that the state must not have any affairs which are not also the affairs of the people.

As we analyze national policy, we uncover many bitter truths, for the perception of which many are psychologically unprepared. Nonetheless, we must try to comprehend the causes of today's national tensions. Only this would make it possible to determine the place of national democratic movements in restructuring.

First. The main reason for our national conflicts today is that Lenin's attempt to organize the union as a federation was unsuccessful. Stalin created an empire, disdaining not even the resources of imperial foreign policy. He created a unitary state in a federated package, without local self-management, in which the outlands were subordinated to the center in all things. This reality, and nothing else, can explain both the national injustice and, as a reaction to it, the constant reproduction of centrifugal aspirations. How do we act today in the conditions of democratization? We were reminded here, in words that immediately send up red flags, that the central power has the priority in this area. But I think that it is already obvious to everyone that it is impossible to maintain the integrity of the state by the methods which had been used to maintain it previously. These methods will encounter increasingly greater resistance from all peoples. We have no solution other than to really restore the right of nations to self-determination, and to impart to the union both the content and form of a union of equal sovereign states, and ensure broad national-territorial and national-cultural self-government by people who presently do not possess their own statehood. It is precisely the right to self-determination, and not leftover rights bestowed by a strong center, that must become the source of sovereignty of the republics, and it is the treaty that must become the source of federal law. In other words we are faced with constitutional reform of the union in order to ensure a return to Lenin's ideas of federalism.

In this connection I would like to say a couple of words concerning the other side of the so-called "Russian coin," which has already been discussed by Deputies Oleynik and Belov. Because of the truncated structure of

the Russian national state, and because of administration of Russia not as a country but as a conglomerate of oblasts, national self-consciousness is being eroded, to be substituted by an all-Soviet identity. In today's conditions this is inhibiting national rebirth, and as a result the struggle of other republics against bureaucratic centralism are perceived by many in Russia as a struggle against Russia. Creation of all of the political institutions of Russia would make the majority of union departments and organizations unnecessary. They would be replaced by direct, mutually advantageous, and equal ties between republics. And perhaps we would then be able to count how many "Russian" nations there really are in this country: one, or 15 with regard for the number of union republics, or 35 with regard for autonomous republics. This absence of clarity is the source of tense national relations in the republics. Incidentally, yesterday's SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA reflected the real support possessed by some comrades who claim to fully represent all of the non-Estonian, or so-called Russian-language, population of the republic.

The union's constitutional reform is called upon not only to settle the national issue but also to alter the countenance of socialism in the direction of a self-managing democratic society. This is something all nations, both large and small, equally need.

Second. Recently we have been getting away from believing ourselves to be the wisest and the most farsighted, and we are beginning to consider world experience, albeit selectively for the moment. World experience demonstrates that the path of modern civilization is one of international integration, and not a path of centralization and subordination. Free peoples whose interests as sovereign subjects of historical action are coordinated and not subordinated may undergo integration. But the kind of centralization and central subordination that has evolved in our country is in deep conflict with the objective tendency of integration processes lying in the plane of national structures. Russia, and all the more so Moscow, cannot claim to be the center of even the Slavic languages, not to mention Turkic, Baltic, or Finno-Ugric languages. As we can see, the role of the church and religion is not diminishing in the modern world. In this respect only the center of the Russian Orthodox Church coincides with the traditional center of the state. For the followers of Islam these centers are located beyond the state, as is true for Catholics and some other Christians. The cultural system of Latvians and Estonians, for example, gravitates toward the culture of Scandinavian peoples and the Baltic basin. As we know, in terms of kinship the Estonian language has its roots in Finland. What I am getting at is that the uniqueness and repeatability of our peoples is not only the product of their internal self-development but also the result of the wealth and variety of interethnic interactions. Opening ourselves up to the world and claiming a proper place for our state in the development of the world economy, protecting the living environment, and developing human culture, we must also grant this right to all nations in conformity with their historical and cultural features.

Unequal socioeconomic development of nations and countries is a reality of world experience. This phenomenon is designated in the political lexicon by the concepts "North-South" and "West-East." These polarities are also represented in our state: For example we have institutes of the USA and Canada, and of the countries of Asia and Africa, but we do not have an institute of Central Asia and the ethnic groups of the Soviet North and East. This problem has never been seriously entertained, even though Lenin and the decisions of the 10th party congress, which bear his imprint, encouraged meticulous consideration of these realities in nationality policy.

Inasmuch as the topic of national relations appeared later than others in restructuring, we are not yet ready to analyze them in the commonly accepted terms and concepts of policy. More often than in application to other phenomena, in this area we employ metaphors and invocations such as "common home," "indestructible friendship," "a strong center" and "strong republics." Let's talk incidentally about a strong center: What is this? Has a 16th republic appeared in our midst? If so, then it came into being on its own, without being voted in by all of the other fifteen. I would like to leave my modest mark upon these concepts, and introduce into this matter and develop the concept of a "common blanket" proposed by Deputy Sokolov. It does not take any special insight in order to see that this "common blanket" is stitched together out of swatches of different strength, and that drafts have already been circulating beneath it for a long time. Perhaps everything would be better if each had his own blanket—a down comforter in the North, and a light lap robe in the South.

And the third aspect. What must we do in order to direct national resources into deepening restructuring and renewing socialism? We need measures which would make it possible to restore the society's viability. First of all we need to surmount the destructive consequences of the so-called class struggle against the peasantry and intelligentsia. It is precisely the peasantry that has always been the caretaker of national cultural roots, and of balanced and caring relationships with nature. Alienation of the people from their past, from the natural environment must be curtailed. And this can be done only by peoples, and not by a population, even one possessing ethnic features. Second. The dominance of monopolies in the national republics and krays has disturbed the social integrity of a number of nations. Management by monopoly has put some of them into the position of a social stratum employed in agriculture or in other subsidiary sectors. Unrestrained extensive industrial development has also jeopardized the internal balance of the structure of the Estonian nation. It is transforming into a people with an incomplete social structure. In order to halt this process, we need an abrupt

turn in the conception of economic development of regions and republics, and we must account for the national consequences of all economic measures. This incidentally is the national meaning of our conception of republic cost accounting.

Special mention should be made of the minor peoples of the North and East. For centuries they have adapted themselves to the severe and at the same time fragile and readily wounded natural conditions; they have created a unique and thrifty culture of interaction between man and nature; they have preserved a viable natural environment for present generations and for the country. In gratitude for this, our state repeated one of the greatest disgraces of European civilization, which annihilated the American Indians. We repeated this at the threshold of the 20th century in a country which refers to itself as socialist. All is not yet lost; and the state must atone for its fault before the minor nationalities of the North, and not only the North. A special organ should be created in the Soviet of Nationalities to protect minorities, to develop a state program and to gain public support in resurrecting a normal working life, and through it, both the human and national worth of the minorities.

I have before me an appeal from minorities, adopted at an international meeting of writers of Finno-Ugric nations, as well as of the Kurdish people, the Crimean Tartars, the Gagauz people, and some others, which I propose entering in the record of the congressional proceedings.

Next, I suggest that cultural policy must turn toward restoration of our country's cultural diversity. This is a complex task, since the integrity of the cultural systems of many peoples has been disturbed. In a number of cases this happened due to displacement of national languages from science, from politics, and from higher and even secondary education. The languages of even some peoples numbering in the many millions are gradually transforming into backwoods speech of which people in the cities are ashamed. World experience and our own experience suggests that loss of national and ethnic cultural roots makes the culture defenseless against the onslaught of commercial culture, and leads to a decline of spirituality and erosion of the moral tenets of the human community.

These are all grounds for concluding that the present state of national relations in the country is explainable not by particular mistakes and certain omissions, numerous though they may be. It is the result of the entire system of administrative state socialism. Attempts to remove nations as historical subjects from the life of society have been found to be devastating not only to these nations and to the society as a whole. The society has expended enormous social energy in its struggle against national characteristics. In order to restore the viability of our society, nationality policy must be fundamentally altered. If this does not happen, the structure of administrative government will be preserved to a significant extent, and consequently the anti-restructuring base will also be preserved both centrally and locally.

Renewal of nationality policy must be based on international agreements on the rights of nations. The entire world is citing the words of Mikhail Sergeyevich, who said that every nation must have the right to its own historical choice. Our state is also a unique organization of united nations, one which may develop as a civilized society only in the presence of the legal and political guarantees of national rights and liberties.

In conclusion I would like to once again state my support for yesterday's announcement of an appeal to seek peaceful political and democratic forms of settling all of the national conflicts that have evolved in our country over many long years. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: The floor is given to Deputy Mongo. Deputy Kasyan will speak next.

M.I. Mongo, director of the Department for the Affairs of the Peoples of the North and the Arctic of the Krasnoyarsk Kray Executive Committee (Evenki National-Territorial Election District): Respected people's deputies! Respected voters! Our country is inhabited not only by great nations and large nationalities. Dozens of small nationalities and national groups reside in it. And we cannot resolve a single matter, a single problem while neglecting the interests of even the smallest national group. This was clearly voiced in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report and in the statements of deputies to the congress.

Democratization of Soviet society entails more than just allowing the exercise of the most complete rights and liberties of every person of every nationality. It entails providing chiefly economic rights and broad political liberties to each nation and nationality, and elevating the legal status of union and autonomous republics, and of oblasts and okrugs.

I am speaking at this congress in behalf of people's deputies of most of the autonomous okrugs of the Russian Federation. We have all been elected to the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. By this action, we have done more than comply with the constitutional right of autonomous formations to have their own representatives in higher organs of government; in this way, the overwhelming majority of people's deputies have once again confirmed that they are convinced internationalists. And internationalism presupposes, first of all, deep respect for the right of each nation and nationality to have its own authorized representatives in all soviets, including in the USSR Supreme Soviet. Such representation is all the more necessary

because interethnic relations have grown acute in the country. And as many deputies have mentioned here, they have assumed considerable proportions, and they must be resolved integrally.

The problems of interethnic relations are associated primarily with imbalanced economic and social development of individual regions, with disturbance of the ecological situation and with complication of the demographic situation. It is becoming all the more obvious today that swift industrial development of these regions has come into sharp conflict with the traditional way of life of the indigenous national population. While it was authoritatively declared from this lofty podium on certain dates that we no longer have "national districts" in our country and that they will no longer undergo socioeconomic development, they did exist before, and they will continue to do so.

For many years we have hidden the truth from the Soviet people about the life of peoples of the North and of the minorities, and the northerners themselves we have deprived of elementary concern for their life. The realities have often been distorted and glossed over. The conception of "unprecedented flourishing" of our nationalities prevailed, and there was talk of swift "leaps," "jumps," and "lunges" in a society of developed socialism. Problems that became acute were given the silent treatment, or they were allowed to fall by the wayside.

"Having leaped across the centuries" in the sense of social organization and education, the indigenous population of the northern regions is a decade behind in social development. Thus, the average life span of nationalities residing in this region is 16-18 years shorter than in the country as a whole, the incidence of tuberculosis is 5-6 times higher, and child mortality is 2-3 times greater than the unionwide level. There is an average 3-4 square meters of housing space for every indigenous resident—that is, a little more than is required for a person in the "lower," as Evenks say, "world beyond the grave."

More than 3,000 families—and this is more than 13,000 people—continue to maintain a nomadic way of life. Even in 50-degree frost they live in skin, bark, or fabric tents and not just because the kind of work they do requires this. All of these families have, as they say, "neither house nor home" in the towns. Teachers, doctors, agricultural and cultural workers, aviators, builders, geologists, war and labor veterans, and others living and working in these severe conditions have an urgent need for housing.

In all of the North, including the Tyumen North, where the country's chief drilling rigs are located, only 3 percent of the towns have been supplied with gas, 4 percent have water lines, and 0.1 percent have central heating. There are no sewage systems and water intakes in most towns. In short, people of the taiga and tundra are living in near-primitive conditions, but with television sets, as was stated in a certain Soviet press publication. We say thanks to the creators of the Orbita system, owing to which our constituents can confirm that what we northerners say from this lofty podium is sad but true.

I support the proposal for a special increase in the minimum income of pensioners, war and labor veterans, and disabled persons. But believe us deputies from the autonomous okrugs, and verify this if need be, that we have more impoverished people than do the small nationalities residing in the country's northeast. And therefore we are certain that people's deputies will support us both in asserting the facts and in the efforts to implement the proposals we suggest for improving their life. So what is it we are asserting, and what is it we are proposing in behalf of the nationalities of the North and other ethnic groups?

The territory in which 26 small nationalities of the Far North, Siberia, and the Far East reside is somewhere close to 11 million square kilometers—that is, half the territory of the USSR. And almost all of this enormous territory has been essentially transformed into a raw material-providing appendage of other, more highly developed regions of the country. The lion's share of oil, gas, phosphates, rare and nonferrous metals, and other minerals are extracted there. The entire country has lived off of all of this in part, but half of its territory has transformed intensively into a "dead zone." Thus for example the level of air pollution by industrial enterprises exceeds the maximum permissible concentrations by many orders of magnitude on the Kola and Taymyr peninsulas. In the Tyumen, Tomsk and Yenisey North, and on Sakhalin, Kamchatka, and the Chukchi Peninsula oilmen, geologists and loggers have ruined hundreds of fish-filled rivers and lakes. Their demise is having a deleterious effect on the climate of Siberian rivers—the Ob, Yenisey, Angara, and others blocked by giant dams.

Despite public protests and the authoritative opinion of scientists, the Ministry of Power and Electrification plans to build yet another hydroelectric power plant, and once again a giant—the Turukhanskaya hydroelectric power station [GES] on the Nizhnyaya Tunguska. If it is built, the reservoir will inundate almost all of the vitally important territory of the Evenki Autonomous Okrug. There are also plans for erecting the Amguemskaya GES on the Chukchi Peninsula, and the Iokanskaya GES in Murmansk Oblast, where the majority of the indigenous national population resides.

Each year hundreds of thousands of hectares of Siberian forest are logged or burned down, extremely valuable cedar groves and hunting lands are destroyed, and the felling is creeping ever-northward, all the way up to the tundra. In the European and Siberian North and in the Far East, according to official data over 34 million

hectares—that is, a tenth of the reindeer pasturelands—were removed from turnover in just the last 15 years. But in reality this figure is much greater.

Today, much is properly being said about the priorities of human values, but primarily in application to spiritual and cultural values. However, the Siberian taiga (which is an "oxygen factory" for the entire planet) and all of the unique Siberian and northern nature are the property of all civilization, and yet it is being intensively destroyed by industrial "invaders." The dominance of departmental monopolism and the need for antimonopoly legislation have already been discussed here. Numerous "extracting" ministries and departments are systematically polluting the North's fragile ecosystem—chiefly because an enormous part of the gas is being burned off, oil is being spilled over the land and during transportation, and timber is clogging the river channels.

From my point of view the time has come to develop and implement a special law on responsibility for mismanagement and carelessness. How many explosions such as the one that occurred this week can the country endure? Such a law is needed by the entire country, but chiefly by its most vulnerable regions—the Far North and the Arctic.

I also feel it necessary to secure constitutional rights of priority land use of hunting lands and reindeer pasturelands, as well as coastal waters, rivers and lakes (as the basis for traditional forms of livelihood) for the small nationalities, and thus solve our acute problem of full employment for the indigenous national population. Otherwise the habitat of the northern nationalities and national groups is threatened not only by ecological but also ethnic catastrophe.

Comrades! We have implemented effective measures to protect polar and brown bears, and other exotic animals and birds on the list of endangered species. But we also need to enact a law to defend the right of the indigenous national populations of our state's outlying districts to live on their own ancient land. All of the minorities of Siberia, the Far North, and the Far East, which number 180,000 persons, are steadily approaching a danger point—total assimilation. Take for example Evenks, of whom I am a representative. In the late 19th century there were over 70,000 of them, while according to the latest census a few more than 20,000 remain. And representatives of nationalities such as the Entsy, Yukagiris, Kets, Aleuts, Tofalars, Nganasans, Negidals, and others number from 300 to 1,000. The proportion of the indigenous population is declining dramatically in all 10 autonomous okrugs, and it is now from 23 percent in the Koryak Autonomous Okrug to 3 percent in Khanty-Mansiysk Autonomous Okrug.

What is the principal cause of such meager numbers? Primarily the fact that the environment itself of northern and other nationalities is being physically destroyed. Second, economic, housing, and cultural construction is proceeding extremely slowly there. The availability of housing, hospitals, and schools is 70 percent of the unionwide level. It must be recognized that even we have not been undertaking decisive measures locally to improve the living conditions of northerers until recently. And third—one of the main causes from my point of view, the minorities have long ceased to be the masters of their vast land. The status of the autonomous okrugs, which has been granted to 10 nationalities, is itself essentially nothing more than a declaration. When it comes to budget allocations, the autonomous okrugs are even equated to ordinary rayons, and they experience perpetual petty wardship of kray or oblast organs, and intense pressure from various union and republic ministries and departments. The time has apparently come to create, or more accurately resurrect, a special organ under the government of the Russian Federation—a state committee similar to the Committee for Assistance to Northern Nationalities, which existed since the early 1920s and which was groundlessly abolished in 1935.

We also need statewide protection of the rights and interests of small nationalities. In this connection it would be proper to create a permanent commission for the affairs of northern nationalities and national groups in the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. If we wish to continue to improve national relations in application to the minorities, and rescue them from total disappearance from the face of the earth, we could not do without such a statewide organ. The Law on Small Nationalities and National Groups, which was discussed earlier, particularly by Comrade Nishanov and other people's deputies, would also be helpful in this.

This permanent commission must possess both legislative and monitoring functions. Otherwise what happens, comrades? In the last 30 plus years, for example, three major decrees have been adopted on further economic and social development of the regions in which northern nationalities reside. All of them doubtlessly played a positive role. In these years many scientific conceptions and specific-purpose programs for the development of these regions have been developed, and dozens of dissertations have been defended. But as with the preceding ones, new decrees and new conceptions would hardly be implemented, because we do not have a statewide legislative organ which would monitor fulfillment of all of these good programs and decrees.

Judge for yourselves, comrades. For example 42 union ministries and 36 ministries and departments of the Russian Federation took part in the writing and implementation of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures for Further Economic and Social Development of the Regions of Residence of Northern Nationalities" dated 7 February 1980. No committee—neither of union nor, all the more so, of republic significance—would be able to monitor their activity. This is why we propose:

1. Creating a permanent commission for the affairs of northern nationalities and national groups possessing legislative and monitoring functions under the Soviet of Nationalities. We, the people's deputies from the autonomous okrugs, are prepared to take a direct part in its work.

2. Preserving, in accordance with the USSR Constitution, representation of the indigenous national population (irrespective of its numbers) of autonomous okrugs in the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The governmental and legal status of autonomous formations must be raised, and new autonomous okrugs, as well as national regions and national rural soviets, in which nationalities not possessing their own autonomy reside, must be created. Autonomous okrugs must be granted the right of legislative initiative at the union and republic level, and development of national culture and languages must be promoted.

3. The population of all of our union republics, especially of the Russian Federation, is multinational and multilingual. Therefore in order to further harmonize interethnic relations, I propose creating two chambers in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet—a Republic Soviet and a Soviet of Nationalities, in order that each nationality and national group would have its own representatives in the supreme organ of republic power.

As far as other union republics are concerned, this would be exclusively their prerogative. All of these measures would become a specific contribution of our congress to the further improvement of interethnic relations in our common home—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: The floor is given to Deputy Kasyan. Deputy Minnullin will speak next.

N.A. Kasyan, division director of the Leshchinovskiy boarding school of the city of Kobelyaki, Poltava Oblast, Ukrainian SSR (from the Soviet Charity and Health Fund): Dear comrade deputies! Respected presidium! First of all permit me to acquaint you with the text of a telegram I received the day before yesterday from Donetsk.

"Congress, telegraph message, Moscow, the Kremlin, USSR Congress of People's Deputies, Deputy Nikolay Andreyevich Kasyan. All of your patients, colleagues, and friends await your statement at the congress. Down with the party! Long live restructuring! All power to the Soviets! Your student from Donetsk, Ivan Ivanovich Griboyedov. 34010, Donetsk-100, Shevchenko Boulevard, Building 6, Apartment 14."

Let me reply. I do not know you, and I do not desire to know you. (Applause). Even if you show me a certificate signed by me and the director of the Kobelyaki Polyclinic that you had served an apprenticeship with me. The only Griboyedov I know is the one who wrote the famous "Woe From Wit." (Applause).

On arriving in Moscow for the Congress of People's Deputies, to be honest I did not prepare myself to speak from this lofty podium. My thoughts were these: There are great people among the deputies, there are greater people—scientists, of whom there are more, and there are those who are the greatest. It is probably to them that this podium will be offered. And you know, I deeply erred, I simply did not expect that the process of restructuring had opened the door so widely to real democracy, to such enormous and broad freedom of speech and freedom of action.

The floor was given to some representatives in good will, while others themselves took the floor, forcing themselves up to the podium and lining up at it. Some simply shouted from the floor, attempting to attract the attention of not only the quietly sitting deputies but also, of course, television. Foolish or not, such an act will be seen throughout the country and beyond its borders. (Applause).

This unwittingly brought to mind Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev's performance at the UN General Assembly, when, demonstrating Soviet "culture," he took off his shoe and pounded it on the podium with the words "kuzkina mat" ["Kuzkin's mother"?]. Of course this "cultural" tactic cost our state an extremely substantial fine, and shameful condemnation by representatives of the whole world. We have not yet gone this far in our congress, though it would not bother me to employ such a sanction, or a similar one, against certain deputies. (Applause).

Comrades! It was we, after all, who elected the presidium, who voted for it, who voted for Mikhail Sergeyevich and for his first deputy. Then why are we not showing respect to our presidium, why are we not respecting all who are sitting in the hall? Why is it that those of you who are so diligently striving to disobey the chairman and get yourselves on camera do not respect either the presidium, or those present in the hall, or yourselves? Is it really that much fun to come up to the podium in your nice clean suits and ties, and demonstrate your lack of culture?

I am a deputy from the Soviet Charity and Health Fund. Doing others good is my main goal. Could it really be that you do not desire the same thing? Could it really be that you are unable to behave in a cultured manner, so that people out there in other countries would say proudly: Yes, that's what the Soviets are like! And despite the fact that they have survived a revolution, collectivization, war, humiliation, defilement and outrage, they still remain Soviet people. (Applause).

Numerous are our shortcomings, mistakes and omissions, many bad things have we done to our people "in someone else's name" and "on the basis of someone else's instructions." There were Stalin and his accomplices. There was the faithful "Leninist" Nikita Sergeyevich and his retinue, under whom we "overtook"

America in meat and milk and have already been living under communism since 1980. There was the Dnepropetrovsk era of Leonid Ilich Brezhnev and his faithful helpers, some of whom still occupy ministerial chairs and are striving to restructure themselves but having been unable to do so yet. But by whom, and on what basis, were we given the right to outrage the communist party, to withhold our trust from it? By whom were we given the right to outrage the nation or the republic? By whom were we given the right tc outrage or at least cast a shadow of mistrust upon our Soviet Army, upon the Committee for State Security? (Applause).

I, a simple doctor, was elected a people's deputy. I was elected never expecting this, and never even dreaming that someday I would become a deputy. I know that there were some who were very much against making Kasyan a deputy. Telephone calls were made to Moscow, to the election commission, to the Soviet Charity and Health Fund to find out if there was still a chance that Kasyan might not get the necessary number of votes. What they heard was no, Kasyan would be voted in.

But I am not resentful of such leaders. "God will forgive them," was what was said to me in reference to the like by The Most Holy Catholicos of All Armenians Vazgen I. I also forgive them, and I will never harbor ill feelings against them. If only they would join the restructuring effort more quickly, and do everything necessary in order to build the Manual Therapy Center in Kobelyaki, so greatly needed by all Soviet people and by all who come to Kobelyaki from abroad for treatment. (Applause).

In this hall, and I mean right in this hall, there are not less than 200 persons to whom Kasyan had once provided medical care long ago. And if we consider that in Kobelyaki I receive 400-450 patients each day, and that every time I come to Moscow on "important" and "very important" matters, every day, or more accurately every early morning, I receive 250 or 300 persons, we find that our entire country is now fervently beseeching the USSR State Planning Committee [Gosplan], the Ministry of Health, and the Ministry of Finance with approximately these words: "Dear, kind ministers! Please resolve the issue of building this center in Kobelyaki more quickly. And if the cost of this construction climbs beyond R4-5 million, we are certain that the USSR Council of Ministers, Gosplan, and the USSR Ministry of Health would throw in another 2-3 million. And in 1992 you will all be able to say proudly: 'You people watching over the project and you, Doctor Kasyan, be joyful, take this Manual Therapy Center and put it to use, together with its hospital, polyclinic, vacation hotel, dining room, and quarters for medical personnel. We are charitable as well, and we have shown this to you'." (Applause).

Yesterday, or more accurately the day before yesterday, I was met at the hotel entrance by an extremely elegantly dressed man, who said: "Nikolay Andreyevich, you are a very popular fellow among Muskovites, and we would like it very much if you could speak in support of our program at a rally in Luzhniki." I replied evenly: "Look, I don't like rallies, and I don't like wasting precious time. Early Monday morning it would be better for me to receive patients, do them some good, and then quietly go to the Palace of Congresses and speak from its podium when the floor is given to me. I'm not about to fight the crowds in your rally, or shout myself hoarse. And I will be both heard and seen by many more people than in your rally."

Let me also say this. Dear comrades, dear deputies! Let's respect the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. We've already spilt all of the dirt we have. I would imagine we put foreign journalists of some countries who were hoping to find this dirt on their own out of a job. And they witnessed our "unusual culture," "our respect for the presidium." And some of them have already "pulled in their fishing lines" and have gone home to seek other work, because there is no longer anything here for them to seek. (Applause). Rather than throwing all kinds of dirt, let's decide how to get ourselves out of the current situation, and what priority tasks we must accomplish in order to get the country out of its crisis. It is for this reason that economists and other ministers are present here today.

And anyway, don't we have anything good that could be said from this podium? Are we really so broken down and ruined that we should be the focus of someone's venomous laughter? We are Soviet people, after all, and in many areas we have been and are being heroic. Even here at the congress we have proven so. Take for example the action taken by Deputy Kazannik, who voluntarily gave up his seat in the Soviet of Nationalities in favor of Deputy Yeltsin.

Some people can be so lucky! But I have not been so lucky. One would think that I wield authority, and at national scale at that. But the truth is otherwise. Let me tell you in confidence that rather than going to meetings, I should be treating patients, and returning life and the joy of labor to them. But there is not enough of me for them, and I do not have enough spare parts by which to maintain my own health. And when it comes to students, real students, they are few, I can count them on the fingers of my hands, while token students are very numerous—in the hundreds. These token students work in cooperatives, they print calling cards stating that they are supposedly students of Doctor Kasyan, and they take money from sick people and live with this refrain: "Restructuring's done well by us, thanks, my dear, to Kasyan's fuss." (Laughter in the hall, applause).

So it is that Kasyan fought for the triumph of manual therapy, he was subjected to all kinds of inspections hundreds of times, thrice he was charged with criminal wrongdoing, and each time without adequate grounds. And now they proudly call themselves his students, and rake in the money from the misfortunes of others. They

even go so far as to exhibit certificates attesting that they had undergone apprenticeship with Doctor Kasyan. Look at these photographs, they say, here's a picture of Kasyan and me.

My dear doctors of manual therapy! Listen to my words from this podium: One is a student of Kasyan if Kasyan himself is able to see and recognize his student.

Comrades! We touched upon the issue of Vladimir Ilich Lenin's Mausoleum here. Leave our leader alone, let the archives rest. Millions of people from the entire planet go to him, in the mausoleum. We live with him and, when we visit the mausoleum, perhaps our own mistakes come to mind on occasion, and we find the ways to correct them. (Applause).

Much has been said here about the hard life of our rural areas. And we would not have talked so much about this, had there been less aimless running back and forth. Those who argued that rural villages lack a future are probably still living in good health; they are living, but the villages have been destroyed. (Applause).

We go on creating and then pulling down, one after another, first the MTS [automotive-tractor station], then the selkhoztekhnika, then the rapo [rayon agro-industrial association], then the oblapo [oblast agro-industrial association], then the agroprom [agro-industrial committee], then the agrokhimiya [agricultural-chemical], and then some other "selkhoz," and we can't seem to ever arrive at a common denominator. We sit in ministerial chairs, think up our schemes, write, propose, argue, enact laws and decrees, and then repeal them, we dream, but never come up with anything good. In my opinion this is something very easy to do. It would be good for certain administrative workers to get out of their chairs for awhile and visit the countryside. (Applause). Roll up their sleeves, and take up a hoe or shovel. Then sit at the helm of a Rostselmash combine, communicate substantially with the peasants, and then begin drafting their decrees. After doing so, they will come to understand what a plan entails, how it is to be fulfilled, how pensions for the elderly are to be increased, and how to feed the peasant. (Applause).

Comrades! It will be our job to elect the chairman of the Council of Ministers. You already know that Comrade Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov has been recommended for this position by the CPSU Central Committee. We are aware of his shortcomings and mistakes, but we also know of his services and his good deeds. Comrade Ryzhkov earned special love and respect during his visit to Armenia at the time of its misfortune. (Applause).

I appeal to all of you to behave calmly, to vote earnestly for Comrade Ryzhkov as chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, like I will. Kasyan never makes mistakes about people. (Applause). The only thing is that there are still people around who do not understand Kasyan. But that's all right—someday they will!

Let me ask you once again to behave in a cultured manner, to keep your tempers in check, and preserve the health of those in attendance here. To protect your gallbladders from all mental overloads. Restructuring must proceed in a cultured manner. The entire country and all of mankind are watching us. And the people are making their conclusions about individuals or about certain leaders on the basis of their behavior, on the basis of their personal culture, on the basis of their working qualities, and not on the basis of hot air. (Applause).

And finally, let me appeal to all Soviet people. Come to your senses, people, you can't feed the country with rallies. We can find a solution to our problems only through honest labor and clear thinking. Every minute is precious at the plants and enterprises and in the organizations, collective farms [kolkhozes], and state farms [sovkhozes]. Do not lose precious time. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: The floor is given to Deputy Tufan Abdullovich Minnullin, a writer. Deputy Seleznev will speak next.

T.A. Minnullin, secretary of the board of the USSR Writers Union (Kukmor National-Territorial Election District, Tatar ASSR): Respected comrade president, respected comrade deputies! The delegation of USSR people's deputies from the Tatar ASSR grieves together with all others for the tragedy that occurred in fraternal Bashkiria, and expresses its deep sympathy to the victims and to the families of the deceased. We have distributed our appeal concerning this matter among the deputies. We ask that you support us.

Comrades! With the help of certain deputies, the voters have divided us into active and passive. This is obviously because those who are said to be passive are not perpetually standing in line for the microphones. If this were all we had to do, then we would stand in line as well, but standing in lines is not something all of us would wish to become accustomed to. I think that people's deputies do have other forms of showing themselves to be active. And activeness is something that we need. There are very, very many problems that we have to solve.

On the day after the elections, when I learned that I had been elected a people's deputy, I was naturally pleased with the trust shown by the voters. But after that I was gradually engulfed by a sense of anxiety. My question was this: What was to be done next? It was with this question that I arrived at the congress. During the election campaign we made an abundance of promises, and we were inundated with mandates. How are we to fulfill them? The numerous letters from voters contain questions upon questions. How are they to be answered? And all of them are waiting for answers.

Many of our deputies were elected by rural residents. Of course, the rural resident is more patient than the urban dweller. He had calmly endured many deprivations, and he endures them now. So long as there would be no war, we'll solve the rest of it somehow—so say the aksakaly [translation unknown]. Yes, owing to our state's sensible foreign policy the threat of war is not hanging suspended over our souls, and it is not constraining our will. We can examine our domestic affairs with all seriousness.

As I said, there are more than enough problems here. From implementation of the slogan "All power to the soviets" to the pension for war veteran Gayfutdin Badrutdinov from Sabinskiy Rayon. "At the front, when we went into battle, we were not asked where we worked," he writes, "but now for some reason the pension awarded to a kolkhoz farmer is not equal to that enjoyed by others." I brought this letter with me. The veteran awaits an answer. And together with him wait millions of pensioners whose pensions are less than R50.

I discussed the legal state in meetings with my constituents. They listened to me attentively, they voiced their agreement, and then in a chorus they demanded gas. If I would personally help get gas for at least three villages in each of eight rayons, they promised to even elect me for a second term.

The voters and I also came to an agreement on the general problems of ecology, but they are less prone to discuss this topic abstractly. They are concerned by the death struggle of the great river Volga, and by construction of a nuclear power plant on the Kama. It is being built in the center of the republic's densely populated industrial region. Despite numerous protests from scientists as to the extremely unfortunate choice of location from a geological and geographic point of view, construction is under way.

Of course, an expert commission has been created by the USSR Council of Ministers in response to an appeal from the republic's leadership and the public, but it does not seem to be in any hurry to begin work, while at the same time construction organizations do not have sufficient productive capacities to build hospitals and schools. The voters are patiently awaiting concrete resolution of this issue as well. They also want the fastest possible transition of the republic to cost accounting, they want to live on the money they earn.

What I am saying, comrades, is nothing new, nothing original, and I know that I am repeating others. But the voters, who are watching the progress of our congress on television, want to hear answers to their questions from their deputy. What am I to say to them in reply? Will I be able to answer them in a year, in two, in five?

The nationality issue was also included on the election agenda of Tatar deputies. I would like to dwell in greater detail on this problem, since it is especially urgent today, and it requires immediate solution. As we have all become persuaded, the sweet, kindergarten interpretation of friendship among peoples is now colliding with the real conditions in which the peoples of our country find themselves. Today, as a result of a dogmatic relationship to the problem, and because of violation of Lenin's nationality policy, cracks have appeared in the monolith of selfless friendship achieved by the October Revolution, something that was our chief weapon in the years of the Great Patriotic War. This phenomenon requires deep scientific study. It seems to me that one of the main causes is a failure to practice equality.

We all know the truth that only equals can be friends. This is why this truth has been written into our constitution, and is secured by Article 36. But then, this truth is placed under doubt in that same basic law, in articles 109, 111, 118.

Why, for example, do union republics select 32 deputies from the national- territorial okrugs, and only 11 from the autonomous okrugs? Why are some republics represented in the Soviet of Nationalities by 11 deputies, while others are represented by four? Where is the logic here? What essentially is the difference between union and autonomous republics? Even at our congress, union republics are elevated to a special rank. We in the meantime are relegated to the role of auditors. Why has such a contradiction existed for so many years?

This is not, after all, just a question of prestige. Such inequality has spread throughout our life as a hidden, dangerous disease. It is noticeable primarily in the area of national culture. A territorial-administrative relationship to culture has resulted in a privileged position for some peoples, and a condescending attitude toward others. Why, for example, are the Tatar people, who number in the seven million, forbidden to have their own motion picture industry? Could it be that the republic's economy is not developed well enough? I wouldn't say so. The republic's present gross social product is R23 billion. Could it be that movie makers are not to be found among the indigenous population? No, there are plenty of them. Why is it, for example, that Tatar, Bashkir, Chuvash, Mari, and other autonomous radio and television studios are offered by far less time for their broadcasts than the union republics?

I am speaking here now, and my constituents can watch me on television, but had I been speaking on republic television, they would not have been able to see their deputy. One hundred twenty kilometers from the capital of their republic, people are deprived of the possibility of seeing broadcasts of their own television. This is explained by production, technical, and economic causes, but I am compelled to see other causes here; I see this phenomenon from a political point of view. This is precisely the way tens of thousands of the republic's rural residents see it. I could go on with publication of books, newspapers, and journals, but I am not going to go into it—I don't want to evoke pity.

What is it that we propose as a way out of this humiliating situation? We need to legislatively abolish the administrative and territorial obstacles that stand in the way of total equality of all peoples of the Soviet Union. I feel it necessary to equate the status of all national republics, without dividing them into union and autonomous republics. (Applause).

There may be other ways to deal with this as well; we need to think about them, and discuss them. The one thing we can't do is leave the question open or, more accurately, closed. Friendship and unity are more precious than anything on earth. I'm not talking about laundry detergent and soap. To keep our souls clean, we need more-effective "washing agents." We will survive our economic crisis. But if a crisis begins in our relations, we would hardly come out of it alive and healthy.

The perniciousness of an administrative-territorial relationship toward culture manifests itself especially in regard to our people. The fact is that only a fourth of the Tatar population resides within its own republic. For practical purposes the rest are estranged from the center of concentration of the main forces of national culture, where the nation's public thought forms. Before, the natural desire of Tatars living outside the republic to preserve their distinct way of life was assessed as something close to brazen nationalism. And our desire to acquaint them with our own culture was viewed as something close to interference into the internal affairs of a foreign state. Even the republic's Ministry of Personal Services, it seems to me, had a broader area for its activity than the republic ministries of culture and public education. Today things seem to be returning to the right track. But what meaning have words without a material basis and without legal reinforcement?

Tatar Muskovites have not been giving me any rest these days. There are over 160,000 of them living in the capital. It has now been several years that they have been asking to make Moscow their cultural center. The city authorities listen to them, but they do not hear. Tatar Muskovites are demanding that I say something about this at the congress. And so I speak. I hope that the comrades from the Moscow City Soviet are hearing me, and that they will think about resolving this very important issue.

There is another problem which does not have administrative and territorial boundaries. It is causing concern among all nationalities. Even though this topic has been discussed in the report to the congress and in the statements of deputies, I cannot pass up Hamlet's question: "To be or not to be?" I am not about to philosophize on the need for knowing one's native language. Do we need a natural mother or not? Is this a topic that could even be debated at all? Nor is there any need to prove the necessity of knowing Russian as the language of international communication. But how is this to be reconciled? It is not all that easy to offer recipes, but something has to be done. And it must be done soon at the statewide level. We in our republic are trying to implement some measures, but they are nothing more than a stop-gap. It is impossible to solve this problem through amateurish education efforts. Unionwide legislative acts protecting the national languages and promoting their development are needed.

Interethnic relations in our republic are not as volatile as in some regions, but this does not give us the right to relax. Every fact associated with this problem requires especial attention and study. For example, just prior to my departure for the congress one of my constituents asked me this: Why was not a single representative of the indigenous nationality elected as a deputy in any of the six election districts in the republic's capital, Kazan? It is not at all a simple question, but we deputies are obligated to find an answer. It would be nice if such questions need not be asked. I hope that we will return to the best that was proclaimed by the October Revolution, and that our unity will continue to be the main source of our power.

Last week our republic celebrated Bashkir Culture Days. To the peoples of the two large republics this event was a holiday of friendship and a concrete attempt to strengthen the sacred traditions of brotherhood. In this connection I wish to reproach the central press, radio, and television organs. They do not provide adequate attention to such events, and they do not do enough to publicize the principles of friendship with positive examples.

I understand my journalist friends. We have long been praising "paper internationalism," but times are changing, and holidays are now acquiring other significance. This should be made note of as well. There are many among us today who are angry and dissatisfied, and we talk about them a great deal. This is natural in today's conditions, but we should also not forget that anger and dissatisfaction should be not destructive but constructive.

How we love extremes! At the forums of a decade ago, speakers competed to outdo one another in praising each and every thing. Today a number of deputies are competing in who would say more that is bad and painful. Unfortunately some orators have even conspired to suggest that our value is less than what it should be. I think that in any case, if we claim objectivity, we must know how to provide balanced assessments of our actions. Both bad and good.

We need to restore the lost faith in our future, since otherwise it would be difficult for us to live a normal life. And we must live on, dear comrades! Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: The floor is given to Deputy Seleznev. Deputy Kugultinov will speak next.

A.I. Seleznev, first secretary of the Kursk Oblast CPSU Committee (Lgov Territorial Election District, Kursk Oblast): Respected comrade deputies! If one watches and listens to the work of our congress attentively, one may doubtlessly assert that the congress reflects the processes of democratic renewal and of revolutionary transformation that are occurring today in our society. Numerous meetings with the electorate demonstrate that our people give the party and the Central Committee their due for shaking the society out of its apolitical, lethargic sleep, and that they support the policy of restructuring. And at the same time they demand, with full grounds, a strict accounting from party committees and specific workers for their mistakes and for retarded economic and social development, and they demand fundamental solutions that would eliminate the difficulties and problems. Our local party committees are experiencing difficult processes today. They were burdened by people with an unclean conscience who abused their official position, and who may reappear today. But the people can see that the party is undergoing self-purification, that its body is becoming healthier, and in my opinion those who are inciting groundless suspicion of party members, attaching all kinds of labels to them, are treading on dangerous ground. The accusation flung from this podium toward Central Committee Secretary Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev is also dictated by nothing more than a desire to cast a shadow upon the Politburo.

In my opinion such actions cannot be treated as anything but a desire to undermine the people's trust in party workers without analyzing who is working how. There is but one goal here, and that is to compromise someone's reputation. So it was that a deputy from our oblast, who spoke on 29 May, raised suspicions about me for some sort of intrigues in relation to the congress; to be blunt, he assumed a path of fabricating and spreading things allegedly said about me in a manner that is unacceptable in communication between people.

Accusations were voiced here against the Committee for State Security. It stands to reason that the people do not forgive, and will never forgive, those workers who were to blame for the death of people tortured and maimed not only physically but morally as well. But to say this and nothing more would mean telling only part of the truth. The whole truth is that thousands of Chekists and agents devoted to their people and to the cause of the revolution have contributed and continue to contribute their knowledge and often even their life in behalf of the people's salvation. It is owing to their efforts that many large-scale misfortunes have been averted. Could it be that anyone would really want us to forget all of this? Put your faith not in your words or the words of others, put your faith in your actions and those of others. This is what Lev Nikolayevich Tolstoy asked us to do.

There is one other item I would like to talk about. During the congress proceedings we often hear the words president and the country's parliament. Even the newly elected chairman of the new chamber, the Soviet of the Union, made constant use of the word parliament during the first session. But these words do not in any way reflect the essence of our government. If this is just a naive misconception, or just a desire to use a foreign word, then this is only half the matter, half the trouble. We are proud of the power of the soviets, born of October, we are proud of our people's deputies. (Applause).

Next, comrades, let me dwell on one of the problems raised in the report by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and namely the agrarian problem. I do not feel it to be an economic problem—I feel it to be a political one. The fact that an entire conglomerate of issues requiring fundamental, statewide resolution has now formed in the countryside has already been discussed. Still, there are two issues which in my opinion are central: the issue of land, and the issue of people. Concerning people, and namely the status of the modern peasantry, I would like to say the following. I completely share and support the premise in the report that implementation of the decisions of the March plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the new agrarian policy will make it possible to go a long way in returning the peasant to his place as the master of his land, and raise the prestige of rural labor, which has always served as a moral necessity and a yardstick of the personal worth of the individual. But at the same time I am also deeply convinced that without a fundamental turn in the course of the party and state and, if you wish, of all the people, toward the needs of the countryside, without fundamentally changing investment policy, and without bringing it more in line with the production, personal, social, cultural, and spiritual needs of the rural resident, you will have to agree that we will not be able to solve the food problem.

We must implement a system of measures for radical and, by necessity, integral social reorganization of the village. I would like to focus attention on the point that this pertains chiefly to Russia. It is in Russia that rural problems have mushroomed the most acutely and insistently. Much has been said about this both prior to the congress and in the days of its work. As an illustration of this let me cite just a few data on a Russian oblast located in the highly rich lands of central Russia, which has suffered ruin not of its own doing—I am speaking of my own Kursk Oblast. In the last 20 years the rural population has decreased here by almost half, around 300 villages have ceased to exist, the countryside has aged considerably, and the average age of inhabitants has risen to the half-century mark. There are fewer employable persons in our oblast than pensioners, and the most alarming fact is that the number of children has decreased threefold. I suggest that this situation is also typical of many other Russian oblasts. Abandonment of the Russian countryside has not occurred accidentally, after all: Too much time is being taken to solve the problems associated with life support and with improvement of working conditions. Rural areas still lack consistently adequate roads, there are not enough schools and preschool institutions, and in many population

centers—all of you are of course well aware of this—the most elementary things are lacking: stores, medical care, personal services. I think that such an impoverished situation is not encountered in very many republics. We have already discussed the problems of gasifying rural settlements. This is a statewide problem. And I propose that the USSR Council of Ministers be instructed to examine it and find a favorable solution to it literally in the next few years. I share the concern voiced at the congress in regard to pension support to the peasants. You see, the size of the pensions of most of them does not exceed R50. And I feel that we need to immediately repeal, as being unjust, the statute on pensions for kolkhoz farmers approved by the USSR Council of Ministers back in 1954. I propose introducing a new law on pension support for discussion at the congress as early as this year.

Here is something else I would like to talk about. In the last three decades our oblast, and the entire region of the Kursk magnetic anomaly as well, has been working to a greater extent for the whole country, leaving many of its own needs unsatisfied. The oblast's economy depends today on the widely known Mikhaylovskiy mining and concentrating combine together with its concentrating mill, an atomic power plant, and large production associations. We can and must be proud of them, but they are the ones that have attracted half a million persons to the cities, and absorbed, and continue to absorb, the best of the young rural population. This is why I would suggest that it would be suitable to temporarily slacken the pace of extensive development of mining industry and power engineering, which spend hundreds of millions of rubles yearly, and channel the released resources into social reorganization of the countryside and creation of a modern agricultural raw material storage and processing base—in short, into solving the food problem.

There is one other problem I would like to touch upon. We, the country's people's deputies, could not but be troubled by the state of our Chernozem which, according to Dokuchayev's definition, is the king of soil, and was, is and will be Russia's breadbasket. How is the country using this wealth? Let me say bluntly—far from prudently. In 60 years the thousand-year experience of careful land use and the social mechanism of its transfer from generation to generation have disappeared in many ways: In the race for further profits, the country often ignores the laws of nature and society, and neglects the principles of equivalent exchange. Let me cite just two figures as a confirmation of this. In 100 years the loss of humus in the Chernozem regions has exceeded its utilization by 20 times, and in a number of places by 50 times. In the vicinity of the Kursk magnetic anomaly, soil erosion has attained dangerous proportions. Intensive application of mineral fertilizers and chemicals has led to acidification of half the area, and has aggravated the ecological situation, spreading the negative effects to man himself as well. The question the deputies naturally ask is probably this: What is the solution? There is an answer. It can be found in cooperation between scientists and producers. We need to seriously get involved with land improvement. But let me emphasize, not the kind which results in the interment of material and financial resources, but the kind which does in fact improve the land. For the moment, things are not at all progressing as they would under good government.

Judge for yourselves. The integrated program for raising soil fertility in the period to the year 2000 calls for investing almost R200 billion into irrigation and drainage, while 14 times less is to be invested into forest land improvement, hydraulic engineering, and erosion control measures. I am convinced that this conception of managing the economy is ecologically damaging and ineffective, and I suggest that it be fundamentally reexamined. Today, now that the problem of land use has reared up to its full height, it appears suitable to prepare and adopt a corresponding land law, and to encourage the country's best forces to develop regional scientific farming conceptions which would maximally account for natural, economic, and social conditions and for the new forms of management. Many problems, including the most acute problems of economic use of the land itself, must be solved within the framework of this conception.

As we solve the problems of the present, of today, I propose that we make it a requirement that peasant problems must be worked out into the deep future. In particular it seems that we need to prepare various models of the rural settlement of the 21st century, ones which we can use as the basis for planning new production relations, a new management structure, and a new way of life; models which could be utilized with regard for the features and traditions of a specific locale.

Finally, comrades, many of the problems of agricultural development are being solved more poorly in the Russian Federation than in other union republics. I suggest that the reason for this, among others, is that the existing system of state and economic control is not in keeping with its scale and its multifacetedness; it cannot fully account for and encompass all features of this territory. Therefore I feel it suitable to ask the Central Committee and the Supreme Soviet to think up a system of state and economic control of Russia. In conclusion I would like to say that the deputies from Kursk Oblast, who express the mood of their constituents, were deeply moved by the concern for the state of affairs in the country expressed in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report, and that they support his constructive proposals. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: Comrade deputies! Before the recess, the presidium offers the following draft statement. Permit me to read this statement.

Statement on events in China. Dramatic events have occurred in neighboring China. The Soviet people were promptly and extensively informed about them. The situation has become especially acute in recent days. According to reports from Chinese mass media, clashes

have occurred in China's capital, Beijing, between participants of the mass demonstrations of young people and troops; weapons have been fired, and human lives have been lost. This is not the time for ill-conceived, hasty conclusions and statements. No matter how high emotions might sometimes rise, it is important to patiently seek adequate solutions which would be in keeping with the goals of consolidating society. Of course, the events that have now unfolded in China are an internal matter of the country. Any attempts at outside pressure would be impertinent here. Such attempts would only inflame passions, and they will in no way help to stabilize the situation. We hope that wisdom, common sense, and a carefully weighed approach will prevail, and that a solution worthy of the great Chinese people will be found in the current situation. We sincerely wish that the friendly Chinese people will turn this tragic page of their history over as quickly as possible and move forward on the road of economic and political transformations, on the road of building a strong, peace-loving, free socialist China, a great country enjoying the respect and sympathy of its neighbors, and of all mankind.

What sort of objections or proposals do you have in this connection, comrades? There is a motion to adopt this statement in the name of the congress. Are there remarks of an editorial nature, are there any wishes?

If there are no other wishes or remarks, allow me to poll the assembly on the text of the statement. Please raise your certificates. Thank you. Who is against? One. Who abstains? An overwhelming minority. Thus the congress adopts this statement. An overwhelming minority abstained. There will now be a 30 minute recess.

A.V. Gorbunov: Respected comrade deputies! We continue the work of the congress. The floor is given to Deputy Kugultinov. Deputy Lizichev will speak next.

D.N. Kugultinov, chairman of the board of the Kalmyk ASSR Writers Union, Elista (Iki-Burulskiy National-Territorial Election District, Kalmyk ASSR): Dear comrades! Although Friedrich Engels referred to the event respectfully—"His Majesty," nonetheless it was a wonderful event. I am a Kalmyk. Today is 6 June 1989. The entire country and the entire world are celebrating the 190th anniversary of the birth of Aleksandr Sergeyevich Pushkin. I am the one to whom he once referred:

"Word of me will spread over all of Russia the Great, and my name will be spoken in every language existing within it, the proud grandson of the Slavs, the Finn, the still wild Tungus and the friend of the steppes the Kalmyk." (Applause).

What is a genius? God, a prophet, a seer? But how could he predict that on the day of the 190th anniversary of his birth, at the first Congress of People's Deputies of a great power, I, a Kalmyk, would be greeting him and all who are—I am convinced of this—heirs of his soul! (Applause).

When Pushkin said "and the friend of the steppes the Kalmyk," he selected the names of peoples not because he needed a rhyme for the word "language." Finding a rhyme for any word was no difficulty for Pushkin. But Pushkin named these minorities, equating them with all others. And if Pushkin were sitting in the presidium of our congress, I would dare to say that he would have given the floor first not to a representative of the great Russian people, because the great Russian people do not need the kind of assistance needed by, let us say, a Nivkh, a Yukaghir, or a Kalmyk—he would have summoned Rytkheu or some other poet from the minorities to the podium.

Pushkin was wonderful. He was the concentrtion of everything noble about the great Russian people, who created their state initially as a multinational state, and the experience of interethnic relations accumulated by Russia—unique experience found nowhere else, among no other people or power in the world—was unfortunately cancelled by the people's commissar of nationalities, by the "great" expert on "national questions," by the "father of the peoples" Stalin. Great is the experience of Russia, which endured great wars with the assistance of all peoples, and was even victorious over Charles: In 1709, Kalmyks fighting together with Cossacks came very close to taking Mazepa and Charles XII prisoner, and in 1812 Kalmyk cavalry and a camel regiment entered Paris.... Bashkirs, Circassians and all peoples were one in the fatherland, and to all of them, Russia was both a fatherland and a mother. But how is it that today we are speaking from this podium about real misfortunes, and not fabricated ones? My heart overflows, and my soul is pained when we speak about Nagorno-Karabakh, when we speak about Azerbaijanis, when we speak about Turks. My soul is pained, and I do not know how, when and at what time all of this came to be so.

Dear comrades, this is, after all, the ultimate question. I know that these questions have spilled out like from an erupting abscess, precisely right now, in our days—the days of the great congress, a truly historical congress. I have been thinking these past few days that yes, the congress, the first Congress of People's Deputies, will go down in history. I have even sensed the presence of great figures in history. To my mind, Peter I is seated somewhere here. He is watching with satisfaction and saying: "Well done, my descendants. You are speaking as I would have wished—not as if quoting from books, and with everyone able to see who's who." On the right I see Vladimir Ilich Lenin on the steps with his notebook. He is listening to us with alarm and sorrow, and he is saying: "How can there be no soap? How can there be no matches? How many years have passed?" He is told: "It's now 1989." And Lenin thinks: "What has happened, why is this so?—This is not what I taught them. How has it happened?" And it seems to me that he must be horrified by the idea that he had made a mistake. I heard about Lenin's mistake when I was 23—at that young age when the words "Lenin" and "mistake," or "Stalin" and "bad" would leave people in a mystical horror. But then

in jail cells, on journeys, and in camps I heard about it again and again from old Leninist Bolsheviks. I realized that yes, Lenin had made a mistake, and his mistake was the following. I thought this when I was sitting in this auditorium on the first 2 or 3 days before the election of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. His mistake, the old Bolsheviks told me, was that Lenin, working in the Council of People's Commissars, left everything else to Stalin, and in the space of 2-3 years Stalin concentrated power within his own hands to such an extent that even Lenin's note about the lover of hot dishes and the need to transfer him was not acted on at the well-known congress. And it was the Stalin years that prevailed in our country and led to all the problems that we now cannot resolve. That was the mistake. I am afraid now—in our transitional period when we are deciding what our state will be like—that we may be seduced by the beauties of democracy and suddenly distracted by highfalutin words, and say: "Comrade Gorbachev, deal with the soviets! Comrade (I don't know who), deal with the party!" And then something might suddenly happen again.

I, who survived the Great Patriotic War, I, who survived the prisons and the camps, I, a graying Kalmyk, whose people have been decimated, have absolutely no intention of flattering Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev here. Actually, however, no matter how bitter it might be for us, no matter how shameful it might be for us, another leader such as he is not to be found today in either our country or even the entire world. And here is why. When the results of the election were announced, when 96 percent of the votes went to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, to be honest I had an urge to embrace and kiss each one of you, to ask forgiveness in that perhaps I had thought a little too badly of you. As it turns out, 96 percent are persons of like mind with me, my brothers, 96 percent of our congress are motivated by a single goal, by a single great objective: to make our country wealthy, to make our people fortunate. Probably everyone here experienced this feeling when the election results were announced. Ninety-six percent: This represents hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of voters behind each one of us. This means that all of our Soviet people are for restructuring.

Dear comrades! I have spoken about my people, who have been resurrected, and the Kalmyk ASSR has been resurrected, but I would like to talk here about other peoples that have not yet come back. I left on my seat a folder full of telegrams from the Crimean Tatars, from Germans from the Volga Republic, from Turks who were deported from the southern borders of Georgia, and from many peoples who tearfully turn to each of us, each deputy, to ensure that we are not complacent and that when we talk about the equality of all the peoples and about the brotherhood of all the peoples we also remember those who are not represented at this congress—those peoples whose lands have not been returned, those peoples whom Stalin condemned to long years of sorrow and long years of second-class citizen status. There must be no status in the Land of the Soviets—a socialist country, a communist country—whereby people are classed as the wrong sort just because of the shape of their eyes or the color of their hair. This should not happen! And I want to propose that we should do something about it at this very congress. We should adopt a law restoring the Crimea's autonomy. We should adopt a law restoring the Volga German Republic. We should adopt a law which would give each of them wings, and on these wings they would invisibly attend the congress tomorrow and applaud each of us, saying: "Yes, every deputy has a heart and understands the sorrow and truth of other people." (Applause).

I would like to submit a proposal that at this congress we adopt a law under which not a single people in our country would ever be subjected to such actions as they had been subjected to under Stalin. We need to adopt a law on the rights of peoples. I do not know how the lawyers will word it, but our conscience will formulate these laws, and make our country one of truly exemplary friendship among all peoples!

Now a few words about the Kalmyk ASSR. Pushkin said so many things so well. We are fortunate, remember Pushkin: "Farewell, my gentle Kalmyk girl." Do you remember? (A stirring in the audience).

"To the ill luck of my adventures, it was the habit of good behavior that kept me from pursuing your kibitka over the steppes...."

And this gentle Kalmyk girl, who now lies suffering from AIDS with her child on Sokolina Hill, telephoned me. Yesterday our entire delegation visited this sole hospital in Moscow in which AIDS is treated. And we were astounded by the squalor of this hospital. This is a shopworn, second-rate hospital, and it is supposed to carry on the fight against the plague of mankind—AIDS. This is terrible. I recently returned from the United States of America, I saw how AIDS is being fought there, and I would like to turn all of your attention to this. Of course, I do understand: We have a time limit, but when I speak about AIDS in children, about mothers suffering from AIDS, and deputies shout "Enough," somehow I begin to feel uncomfortable. Thank you. (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: The floor is given to Deputy Aleksey Dmitriyevich Lizichev. Comrade Alekseyev will speak next.

A.D. Lizichev, Army general, chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy, Moscow (from the CPSU): Respected comrade chairman! Respected comrade people's deputies! The Armed Forces are called upon to maintain strategic stability in the world and to guarantee the security of the Soviet State and its allies against aggression. This is the fourth year that I am a member of the country's Defense Council, and I am able to report to the people's deputies that in all of these years the Defense Council has been

comprehensively, deeply, and competently examining the basic problems of the country's defense and development of the military with the participation of prominent specialists, scientists, and designers, and the decisions that have been adopted in regard to restructuring the Armed Forces are both weighted and far-reaching.

Judge for yourselves: In these years we have developed and adopted a new defense doctrine, the principle of reasonable sufficiency for defense was adopted and has begun to operate, over 1,200 intermediate- and shorter-range missiles have been destroyed, the Armed Forces are being reduced, and withdrawal of our troops from friendly countries is beginning. Vienna talks on conventional arms reduction are proceeding, and the quantitative composition of the Army and Navy, the number of servicemen in the armed services, and the country's military budget have been made public. Observers and inspection groups come to our country for major military exercises, and we go to theirs.

Today this is a reality, this is the result of a new way of political thinking in defense policy, and of firm day-to-day leadership of the Armed Forces on the part of our party, its Central Committee, and its Politburo. In the Armed Forces themselves, restructuring is being staked primarily on the qualitative parameters of their development, on the basis of a weighted assessment of the military-political situation, and the country's real possibilities.

Measures are being implemented to raise combat readiness, the troops and fleets are being equipped with modern armaments, operational art and tactics are being adjusted appropriately, and operational, combat, and political training are improving. A solid legal foundation is being laid beneath all military restructuring work. I am certain that the recently created Committee for Defense and Security Questions and development and adoption of the USSR Law on Defense will strengthen the legal basis of restructuring of our Armed Forces even more.

The party principles concerned with the style and methods of work of personnel, and of their selection and placement are being followed firmly. The permanent staff of the central apparatus of the Ministry of Defense and the absolute majority of commanders in chief and commanders have grown younger and been turned over by half. Almost 1,400 general positions and 11,000 colonel positions have been abolished. These processes have not been painless and easy. They have affected the destinies of people. But we undertook them anyway, and now we can see that we had made the right choice.

The Armed Forces are also actively participating today in the country's economic life. In particular, the volume of our capital construction is almost R4 billion. Our subsidiary farms and military state farms [sovkhozes] supply meat and vegetables to all personnel for 3 months out of the year. We are conducting extensive road building projects through our own efforts, employing more than 20 formations in the Russian Non-Chernozem Zone. The railroad troops are carrying out great national economic tasks. Each year the Army and Navy participate in the harvest. Our military builders carry out tasks in behalf of over 10 union ministries, often in the harshest and, at times, extreme conditions.

A tendency for party work to become more active and for improvement of the rule of law and discipline has been noted. Discipline has grown stricter. In the last 3 years the crime rate has been reduced by more than a third. We are eradicating dedovshchina [bullying], we have taken a strong stand against it, and the procuracy conducts investigations on every incident. The number of persons sentenced by the courts of military tribunals has decreased by over 50 percent. However, the fundamental improvement of discipline required today from us by the party Central Committee and restructuring has not yet been achieved. And public criticism of us in this matter is entirely right.

On one hand comprehensive analysis of the demographic situation in the country shows that, comrades, we have practically no possibilities for selecting conscripts today. We thought that such a possibility might arise in connection with the reduction of forces, but there came a need to postpone call-up of students. This was doubtlessly the right decision. And so we are once again calling up sizable numbers of young people who already have police records, who suffer both physical and moral flaws, and who have become acquainted with both drugs and alcohol, chiefly in the construction troops. But these are, after all, our fellow countrymen. Therefore as they say in our Army, we will welcome them into our unified combat formation. We concurrently ask the ministries and departments possessing facilities at which railroad and especially construction troops are working to treat them not as stepchildren but rather to display real concern for their personal lives and labor organization.

On the other hand, comrades, the labor of soldiers and officers is generally becoming increasingly more stressful mentally and difficult both psychologically and physically, in view of the fact that we are being armed with new technology characterized by complex electronic systems, radio and video technology, and new control and monitoring systems. In addition we must keep in mind that over two-thirds of our soldiers are serving along the entire perimeter of our country and beyond its borders, often in still-unpopulated places, and personnel of forces serving combat duty must spend days at missile and radar consoles and at the controls of airplanes, helicopters, and ships. And not all are always able to withstand the nervous and physical load of such service.

But given all of the shortcomings we have in the Armed Forces, as the chief of the Main Political Directorate I can report to the congress with full justification that the Armed Forces are living together with the people, they are living the life of our people. They fully support the

party's course toward restructuring, and the bulk of the privates, seamen, and officers are conscientiously fulfilling their duty. Hundreds of thousands of them fought in Afghanistan, no one "celebrated the coward," no one evaded orders, they all served conscientiously, and they returned from there patriots of the motherland, without griping over the shortcomings, but as warriors of justice, as warriors of restructuring. And the officers did not hide behind the backs of their soldiers: One out of every five killed and one out of every six wounded there were officers. And no one has the right to soil their military biography with dark words. (Applause).

Comrades! I think that Ukrainian and Belorussian deputies have good memories of the soldiers who helped to clean up after the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant. These soldiers are remembered well by the citizens of Sverdlovsk and Gorkiy, and now of the Bashkir ASSR in connection with disaster control following the railroad explosions. The Armenian and Tajik peoples remember the actions of the soldiers in those grave hours and days of the earthquakes and recovery from them.

Yes, as with any school, the Army has its disobedient pupils, and it has not only inexperienced but also negligent teachers. The flight of that airplane to Moscow, the accident in the Navy, the incidents in the Air Force, and the improper relations, especially in construction units, have not done anything to increase our authority. This is why the increase in discipline is not very large either. But I would like to assure you that the course toward reinforcement of combat readiness and discipline, reinforcement of one-man command, and improvement of political education work is a sure course, and it will be followed firmly.

Comrades, we accept positive criticism, and we will make the proper conclusions from it, we will correct the state of affairs. But I cannot help voicing certain concerns in connection with the fact that agitators have appeared in a number of our country's regions who see only the bad, who are striving to compromise the Army and its veterans, and undermine the authority of the Armed Forces among the people. Prophets envisioning a time when no army would be needed, and a transition to its manning on the basis of mercenary principles, have appeared, and demands for tearing the Armed Forces apart and dragging off the separate pieces to nationally defined lairs, giving no thought to the consequences of such reasoning, have even been voiced. In some places it goes as far as gross violation of the law in relation to officers and their families. Privates, seamen, and officers are often referred to as invaders, and told to go home. Housing is not allocated to them, and obstacles are created in passport matters, in gaining treatment in local hospitals, and in finding work or schools for family members. When the rising cost of living is compounded by moral pressures and insults, comrades, it is difficult to serve. And the misfortune is that a mature party assessment is not always made locally of such insinuations, slander, and insults.

All of us, including the people in the military, are troubled by the events in Tbilisi. The congress has created an authoritative commission, we have furnished it with all materials available to us, and we are ready to answer any questions. Let's wait for the results of its works, rather than indiscriminately laying all of the blame entirely on the Army, as some have been trying to do. Our main task is to teach the troops that which they would need in war. And we fully support the premise stated here by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev that the Army must do its work. (Applause).

What has always determined the goal of the work of military people has been not personal profit but the highest responsibility for the fate of the fatherland and for its security. This position will continue to be the basis of all of our educational and party-political work. We feel that our Army must be a cadre army, nurtured in the spirit of patriotism, the friendship of peoples of the USSR and socialist internationalism, in the spirit of glorious combat traditions, and manned on the basis of universal compulsory military service and extraterritorial service. Being a socialist Army, it is closely associated with the people, and it is devoted to the cause of the party, the cause of restructuring. We are in favor of the unity of the country, we are in favor of the unity of the Army, of consolidation of Soviet socialist society. (Applause).

Dear comrades! Life shows that our theoretical front has fallen seriously behind today from the rate of politization of society. Our social scientists are unable to keep up with the pace of change both in our country and among our friends and allies. Sometimes the opinion that everything in our country is bad surfaces in the social consciousness, and especially among the young. And as we know, creative power and patriotism do not do especially well on such a substrate.

Attempts to erode the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the Army and the Leninist position on the role of the Armed Forces in defense of the socialist fatherland have grown more frequent. The stakes are too high to hasten to accept such conclusions.

Comrades! The Army has now begun undergoing reduction. Out of 500,000, almost 150,000 are officers and shore-based and seagoing warrant officers. Together with the children and women, this is over half a million persons. To them, the reduction process is far from easy, and sometimes it is even painful. People have to be resettled, provided employment and housing, and so on. The government has adopted the appropriate decisions. We would ask the people's deputies to always treat the problems of providing housing and employment to servicemen discharged into the reserves as objects of your concern, and to resolve their destinies on the basis of the principles of social justice. In the way, for example, that the problems of providing assistance to internationalist soldiers and disabled war veterans are treated in the Ukraine, in Belorussia, and in Azerbaijan.

So much for those being discharged. But those who are remaining in the service have many problems as well. Over a hundred thousand officers have not yet found a home for themselves. Many wives of officers and of shore-based and seagoing warrant officers are unable to find jobs. There is an acute lack of preschool institutions. Many people's deputies have included solution of these problems on their agenda. Thank you! On our part, comrades, let me say that the leadership of the Ministry of Defense and the Main Political Directorate, our commanders and the more than million-strong party organization of the Army and Navy will carry out all of the tasks posed to them by our congress, and do everything to make our Army always modern, dependable, and strong.

Thank you. (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: The floor is given to Deputy Alekseyev. Deputy Rasputin will speak next.

S.S. Alekseyev, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, director of the Institute of Philosophy and Law of the Ural Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Sverdlovsk (from the USSR Academy of Sciences): Respected comrade chairman! Respected comrade deputies! Permit me to share with you some of my ideas on the main thing we are called upon to consider—legislation.

My first idea is a decisive one—it concerns the strategy of legislation. So that our legislation would follow a scientifically thought-out, clear, and tested line. The task we face, after all, is of the greatest proportions. We must create a progressive, perfected, top-class legal system, one which would be in keeping with the standards of a legal state. How do we begin?

There are already over 40 bills in the portfolio of the Supreme Soviet. And we in our promises, in our platforms, certainly vowed to do no less. In our meetings we have heard 10-15 proposals for new laws. How do we deal with this mountain of proposals? What do we do, submit them all for examination together? Or create the kind of queue we love so much? Or perhaps we could consider some great act, an act of the greatest, global significance? If I may be excused for saying so, our economic reform would not have gotten into the situation it now is, had we worked out its formula from the very beginning with clarity of general design. It is only now that we're beginning to comprehend that this formula is one of a transition from bureaucratic management to a socialistically variegated commodity-market economy.

For this, we need a tested legislative policy, we need a clear, strict legislative strategy. All laws are important, and of course, each speaker will say that his law must be placed first. But I think that we need to soberly and objectively determine the priorities.

On one hand I would point out three such priorities—this is the most important thing I would like to talk about. The first priority may be labeled "urgent" and "immediate"—these are legislative measures which must be adopted without delay in the next session of the Supreme Soviet. They include the status of the deputy, the standing order, and mandatorily the referendum. And perhaps a few other laws. I feel that we could adopt a strike law in order to lay a normative foundation beneath this matter, and a law on public associations; we could repeal or update those ukases and those normative acts which have not enjoyed the support of our public, of our people.

The second priority, labeled "of highest importance," has to do with the preparation of the constitution. I paused before that word in order to turn your attention to the fact that I did not say a new constitution. I feel that all four preceding constitutions—four of them!—were not an adornment to our society. These were basically political declarations. Such documents were doubtlessly necessary in 1918 and 1924, when our state was being constituted. But the constitutions of 1936 and 1977.... Their declarative nature had already become in many ways a farce, and, if you excuse my saying so, to some degree a lie.

I think that we must create our first real legal constitution, one which documents, in tight, clear, and perhaps aphoristic language, the existence of our state as a free state, a constitution which would document the free, secure existence of each individual.

It seems to me that future measures aimed at deepening our political reform must be implemented within the context of preparing this constitution. So that we are not jumping all over the place, addressing first one, and then another issue, losing sight of what is most important—the core of our constitutional development.

The third priority would be labeled "a most insistent problem." I feel that after we adopt the immediate legislative measures and make the decision to prepare a constitution, we should turn all of our effort to drafting laws on our economic system with the goal of preparing a package of acts, or a complex of acts, a system of acts in order to transform our economy into an effective, well-running one. Fantastic though this might sound, we could do this in the immediate future, by the first of January of next year.

I say in the immediate future, within half a year, within a few months, because time will not wait. We will be unable to solve a single problem—neither food, nor pension support, nor library affairs, nothing, unless we possess an effective, well-running national economic mechanism. We will continue to concern ourselves with distribution of the products of the money printing press. What we need to adopt in this case is precisely a complex of laws, because experience shows that a bureaucratic administrative system adapts very quickly and agilely to

isolated laws. We must make a single legislative attack, publish a system of laws, change property relations, and introduce variegated relations in order to abruptly alter the situation in our national economy. Do we have the substrate for such laws? Yes, we do.

I think that of course it would be better to adopt one law—on the socialist enterprise. But in the immediate future we could for the moment introduce amendments into two laws—the Law on the State Enterprise and the Law on Cooperation.

Following this is another very important law (I will name seven laws in all), number three. This is the Law on Leasing. It is my deep conviction (on this point I am 100 percent in agreement with Bunich, we are of like mind) that there is no other means of surmounting the main obstacle to establishing a commodity-market economy other than that of establishing leasing, real leasing relations.

Incidentally, certain normative acts have already been adopted. We somehow became stuck on the ukases of 8 April, and it was on 7 April that normative acts on leasing were adopted. It was at that time that I conducted a little survey of my colleagues and friends, asking them what it contained that was new. And you know, in my opinion it documents the most serious revolutionary measures! It states that every labor collective may be transformed into an organization of leaseholders. And we in the Urals want to implement this right away, initiate a mass movement. The products of such a leaseholders' organization become its own property as soon as it is able to increase its collective property. I know of no more abrupt, more serious revolutionary measure in economics. Months have passed, but we have not taken a single step in order to implement these great revolutionary measures.

Next follows the Law on Property. All types and forms of property ownership except that associated with exploitation of one man by another must be documented. A Law on Management. The substrate for this one exists as well. The objective would be to establish a permissive management apparatus doing strictly defined work.

A Law on the Market. Even if it is a minor law, it will become the basis for wholesale trade. And finally, that which Leninist cost accounting began in the early 1920s—a unified tax system—is important. Because that which presently exists—the taxes, the collections, the standards and other withdrawals—in the presence of such a system, no cost accounting, commodity-market, and variegated economy is fundamentally possible.

To this let me add the following. It is my deep conviction that implementation of these laws would be the main blow against the system of dictatorial administration, which presides over this bureaucratic state property.

We have become much obsessed by the problems of power, we keep working around these problems, we digress, and our passions swell. But what we need to do is resolve the issue fundamentally; after that, in my opinion, the economic problem would be fundamentally solved. Such is the nature of the strategic problem.... (Applause).

Literally just a few words about reorganizing legislation. Though I understand the national and psychological underpinnings of the proposal for the Congress of People's Deputies to enact all laws, I am somewhat dismayed by it. You must excuse me, but I found the suggestion appalling: If we make it so that the Congress of People's Deputies would enact laws, the whole idea of a legislative system would collapse. We would end up rubber-stamping laws, or bogging down in disputes over a particular term or some particular issue. And in the meantime the departments would go on publishing normative acts. We would wind up back where we started. You see, the whole idea of a permanent—excuse my choice of word—parliament, and of our permanent Supreme Soviet is that their would be a first reading, there would be discussion in committees, there would be alternatives, there would be a second reading, and then mandatory item-by-item passage of the bill. That is the way to get quality laws. And only a permanently working organ that commits all of its energy, rather than passing bills on the fly, would be capable of accomplishing this. I feel that clarity needs to be introduced into this matter.

And now the definite finale. Comrades! We have very many holidays. On some Sundays we celebrate two or three holidays together. There is a holiday for chemists, and there is one for the land improvers.... But we do not have a holiday of democracy and law. Could we perhaps make the twenty-fifth of May the holiday of democracy and law? The twenty-fifth—a noteworthy revolutionary date. Thank you. (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: The floor is given to Valentin Grigoryevich Rasputin, with Deputy Yarovoy speaking next.

V.G. Rasputin, writer, secretary of the board of the USSR Writers Union, Irkutsk (from the USSR Writers Union): Esteemed comrade deputies! We have unwittingly revealed the contrast between us—between those who came through competitive, multicandidate campaigns, and those who were returned by social organizations. I have repeatedly heard it said over the past few days that the former are the people's choice, while the latter have been planted to impede the activeness of restructuring. I, too, think that the Law on Elections is imperfect and should eventually be altered to favor an okrug system only. Is it normal for some people to vote twice, three times, or even four times: in their own okrug, somewhere at the Cultural Foundation, at the Writers Union, and then again at the Academy of Sciences? Naturally, this should not be the case. (Applause). However, the further our discussions go, the more I am convinced that representatives from social

organizations have been needed at the initial stage of our democratic elections. They have been needed for the sake of pluralism, which we have been discussing a great deal as a condition of democratic existence, because restructuring has now entered a stage of social development and reached a high point inhabited by hawks who are trying to monopolize it. And anyone who disagrees with them is called an enemy of restructuring.

The expression most commonly used at the congress has been "antirestructuring forces." We have heard that if restructuring is a revolution there is bound to be a counterrevolution, too. The discussion about counterrevolution, as you yourselves understand, is a special one without any pluralism. When the hawks come to power they will try to set up a state system for suppressing counterrevolution, and now on the road to power a system of social suppression is being introduced—and quite successfully at that.

It is not a question of the differences which inevitably appear in the development process and which can be narrowed or removed as development proceeds. It is a question of something much greater: the fate of restructuring and democracy. I was pleased to hear Olzhas Suleymenov's idea: If you always row a boat on the left you invariably move to the right. That is not just an image but a law of action for any dynamic [povorotnyy] mechanism, including a social mechanism. The ancient Greek philosopher Plato had something marvelous to say about this. I quote: "Tyranny emerges, of course, from no system other than democracy. In other words, extreme freedom leads to supreme and brutal slavery." So in order to prevent this and ensure that democracy is established in our country once and for all, there is nothing reprehensible about society's needing to restrain the "madness of the brave." Singing the praises of this madness has led in the past to tragic consequences. Now it may propel us from the brink of one abyss to another. So we should treat antirestructuring forces more cautiously. By all logic, you, above all, should be included in that category.

Pluralism is possible as an expression of the variety and diversity of public and political opinions. We have imposed a pluralism of morality upon the country. This is more dangerous than any bomb. The society either supports morality, or it does not support it. There can be no third alternative. The timid voices that have been raised here concerning the primary significance of culture and spirituality in any civilized country have in my opinion fallen on deaf ears. We are more interested in various legislative chicanery. God save me from wise amendments to the constitution and the laws. I would only be amazed if a new constitution following the Stalin and Brezhnev constitutions would be a Yevtushenko constitution. (Applause). I repeat, I am not against any reasonable amendments.... That is precisely what we have gathered together for. Only they have not yet been in the name of the spirit, the worth, and the cultural and moral countenance of the people. Bread and entertainment—that's what they've now quietly written on the banners of restructuring.

Of entertainment we have already had plenty, and entertainment of the most doubtful characteristics at that. We are observing almost open propaganda of sex, violence, and liberation from all moral norms. This is a time of tragedies which for some reason are following one after the other. But have you noticed one thing that happens every time? Just as the voice of the announcer fades away after reporting human misfortunes and sacrifices, the television screen becomes filled with a cacophony of frenzied music. But it's all the same to us, we are free of morality and of sympathy. Where does it go from here? A children's sex encyclopedia containing pictures which would make even an adult uncomfortable is being printed in a succession of issues of the weekly SEMYA, an organ of the Lenin Children's Fund. The fund chairman and the journal editor probably see such education as part of their mission of saving deprived children. "There is no limit to evil," was what they said long ago, and this truth is being confirmed, it is being confirmed over and over again. I don't know how the Georgian delegation feels, but I found it uncomfortable, and I felt it to be a sacrilege when bathing beauties participating in one of our beauty contests froze coquettishly in a minute of silence in memory of victims of the April events. Doesn't such a circus insult your national sentiments?

When it comes to entertainment, as you can see, everything is in order. But if we add to this the bread, kneaded not out of sweat and morality, but acquired in a full assortment in a sale of national wealth, a repetition of the fate of the Roman Empire would not be far behind. You might recall here that someone had severely chastised Comrade Lukyanov for the rise in crime. The causes are many, what can we say? But one of the main ones, and perhaps the most important one, is the moral permissiveness and lustfulness, the unscrupulousness and sensationalism of the mass media, especially of youth publications and programs. (Applause). All of this has engulfed books, movies, and the theater in a muddy flow, and is feeding an entertainment industry parasitizing upon human flaws. Our young people perished senselessly in Afghanistan, and they are being maimed just as senselessly in the undeclared war against morality. Appeals to better behavior are insufficient in such cases: We need a law which would secure and protect morality, and prohibit the propaganda of evil, violence, and flaws. There will come a time when we will regret ignoring social psychology, a science of such importance in this time of change. A knowledge of this science, which makes it possible to account for the mood of the people, is capable of producing the most unexpected and surprising results.

In addition to healthy activity, our society has recently been experiencing activity from which Soviet patriotic content is being leached out and which is being directed

into the channel of nihilism and arrogant claims. The unjust, as we know, is always more active and more organized. During the election campaign certain candidates captured the mood of certain groups with the sensitivity of a barometer. As soon as one of them would display his party card, his popularity would immediately rise as if on wings. (Applause). I am not a member of the party, and I have deliberately avoided joining it, observing how many self-interested people of various sorts are fighting to get in. It used to be profitable to be in the party. This is why it has lost its authority. It is now unprofitable to be in the party, and even dangerous at that. And abandoning it at such a moment is not at all an act of courage, as it is being portrayed to the uninformed: It is just as calculating an act as the one which had earlier opened the door into the party. (Applause). This would have been courageous 10, or even 5 years ago, only don't you think that you are jumping ship a little too early, are you not being led down the garden path by the feelings of those who believe the ship to be doomed? (Applause). There was a time when lawyers explained to us such subtleties of their subject and demonstrated such expert knowledge of the law that it brought joy to our hearts. Such specialists do exist, and we are not far away from a legal state, but what can be said, comrade lawyers, in a situation far from subtlety, in which a colleague of yours wishing to be elected a deputy resorts to sensationalism, tying in a name from the highest echelon of power with criminality? Does the secrecy of investigation no longer exist, has presumption of innocence, or whatever it is you call it, been already repealed? (Applause).

In the nonlegal state in which we had existed for so long, a general and a member of the Politburo could feel himself to be safe, but in the legal state into which you are leading us, judging from everything, neither people in high places nor the simplest individual will be free of either physical or moral destruction the moment he offers a differing opinion or does something not to the liking of another. They will not be free of slander and of the machine of public dishonor, which are in no way better than the machine of drawing and quartering and which, it seems, have already been placed into motion. (Applause). And does it matter at all what the condemned perishes from—from state terror, or from the terror of the environment in a state in which written laws begin to be observed in formal terms only?

Unfortunately, Mikhail Sergeyevich, you did not offer any answer to Deputy Roy Medvedev, who suggested that every time you leave Moscow, and your absence coincides with the absence of Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, a situation close to a revolution arises. I would like to ask you in this connection: Is this so? And did the danger of a revolution arise once again during your visit to China, where you went together with Aleksandr Nikolayevich? If such a malefactor exists in the Politburo, why is the Politburo tolerating him? And if Deputy Medvedev's accusations are groundless, why do you not say so? Is it not evident that in the struggle for power, which is no secret to anyone here, there is a prime target of elimination, against which a lengthy organized campaign has been waged? There is no need to remind you who will be next. (Applause). Alas, respected comrade deputies, all of this has already happened before.

There is all too much in the atmosphere of our congress that is recognizable. We now have our own Kerenskyites—Milyukov, Guchkov, Chkheidze, and I hope that the Georgian delegation will not associate that Georgian name with itself. Others will become visible in time as well. Sometimes we hear appeals for a State Duma, the same old dances with procedural matters which interrupt discussion of important affairs, the same old desire to impose one's own position on others, the same old passion for strong language. You might remember that at first they accused the war minister of betraying the state, and when this came to naught, they accused the empress of the same thing, and the rest was history. Let me repeat here some famous words spoken by another, slightly edited: "You, sirs, need great upheavals—we need a great country." (Applause).

About the country. Never since the war had its power been subjected to such trials and upheavals as today. We Russians are respectful and understanding of the national sentiments and problems of all peoples and nationalities of our country without exception. But we also want to be understood. The chauvinism and blind pride of Russians are but fabrications of those who are playing upon your national sentiments, respected brothers. And I would have to say that they are playing with them very competently. Russophobia has spread into the Baltic countries and Georgia, and it is penetrating into other republics, less into some and more into others, but noticeably almost everywhere. Anti-Soviet slogans are being combined with anti-Russian ones. Emissaries from Lithuania and Estonia are carrying them to Georgia, creating a united front. From there, local agitators are being sent to Armenia and Azerbaijan. This is not a struggle against the bureaucratic mechanism, it is something else. The activities of the Baltic deputies, who are attempting to introduce, by parliamentary means, amendments to the constitution which would allow them to part from this country, are readily noticeable here at the congress. It is not for me to give advice in such cases. You will decide your own fate, naturally in accordance with the law and your conscience. But in regard to the Russian habit of coming to the rescue, my thoughts are these: Would it perhaps be better for Russia to leave the union (Applause), considering that you blame it for all of your misfortunes, and considering that its weak development and awkwardness are what are burdening your progressive aspirations? Perhaps that would be better? This incidentally would also help us solve many of our own problems, both present and future. (Applause). We still have a few natural and human resources left, our power has not yet withered away. We could then utter the word "Russian" and talk about national self-consciousness without the fear of being labeled nationalistic. We could then counter the mass spiritual degeneration of the young that we see before us. And, finally, we could

create our own Academy of Sciences, one which would favor Russian interests and deal with the problems of morality. We would be able to gather the people together into a unified spiritual body.

Believe me when I say that we are tired of being the scapegoats, and of enduring the treachery and the slurs. We are told that this is our cross to bear. (Applause). But this cross is becoming increasingly more unwieldy. We are very grateful to Boris Oleynik, Ion Drutse, and other delegates from the republics who said those kind words about the Russian language and Russia. For them, this is permitted, for us, it is unforgiveable.

It is impossible right now to explain in detail what you yourselves should know anyway—that the blame for your misfortunes lies not with Russia but with that common burden of the administrative-industrial machine, which has turned out to be more terrible to all of us than the Mongolian yoke, and which has humiliated and plundered Russia as well, to a point of near-suffocation. There is no need for detailed explanations, but let me ask this of you: Live with us or not, just as you like, but do not behave arrogantly in relation to us, do not harbor ill for those who have not earned it. But it would be best of all for us to rectify the situation together. It seems to me that all of the possibilities exist for this today. (Applause).

Also true is the fact that this industrial machine that is destroying nature is to blame in many ways today for the interethnic complexities. I am in agreement with those who proposed here not to frighten the deputies, and consequently the whole country as well, which remains glued to television sets, with the gravity of our situation without special need. There is no need to frighten anyone. But there is one most important, fundamental aspect of our existence in relation to which all else fades, no matter what you say, no matter how you try to exaggerate the picture. I am referring to ecology. Nature itself has already written out this word for us not in green but in black paint long ago. We are attempting to build a new, just state. And what reason is there to build it if our years are numbered, considering such a relationship to nature? The State Committee for Protection of Nature has not been up to its functions, and given the nature of its subordination, it cannot carry them out. Before it is too late, we must extricate it from its present situation, in which it lacks any rights, and transfer it to the Supreme Soviet. (Applause).

All of the large-scale nature-transforming projects must be discussed in a commission of the Supreme Soviet and submitted for final approval to the congress. Otherwise we will perish, otherwise we will see more and more government decrees adopted in secret, without the knowledge of the people, such as for example the decree on construction of five petroleum, gas, and chemical complexes in Tyumen Oblast, which are devastating to the country, extremely deleterious to nature, but probably advantageous to foreign firms. Otherwise we will not be able to put an end to the practice of adopting projects without ecological expert examination.

And in conclusion I would like to turn to Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov. Being from Altay Kray, it seems to me that you, Nilolay Ivanovich, who were misled by the ramrods for construction of the Katunskaya hydroelectric power station [GES], have publicly voiced your opinion to the entire country that yes, it should be built. Then in a meeting of the kray party committee you made the qualification: on the condition of a positive ecological expert assessment. However, these words of yours were heard only by those who do not wish to hear them, while your initial statement, which was carried by television, was adopted by the leadership as a signal to act. Many of us deputies are being inundated with telegrams and letters bearing thousands of signatures of the indigenous Altay population and tens of thousands of signatures of those who feel for Altay, we are being inundated precisely because an expert commission of the Siberian Department of the Academy of Sciences and the RSFSR State Planning Committee [Gosplan] will be making a decision this week on approving the construction, and thus the destruction of the last unique natural complex in Siberia. We ask you to consider the Katunskaya affair carefully. Some of us deputies who are participating in the Baikal movement to protect the lake's water had to leave the congress for 2 days in order to attend a regular meeting of this international movement. We saw a film there, presented by the Japanese, about the sickness that is caused by organic mercury. The film was awesome, and the terrible pictures showing the torment and the scale of the misery made one's hair stand on end. There are mercury deposits in the vicinity of the Katunskaya GES. They created doubt in the minds of scientists, but I fear that these doubts disappeared after your unwitting interference, Nikolay Ivanovich.

Out our way on the Angara, water has been descending through hydroelectric power plants for several years. We have more electric power than we know what to do with. Perhaps rather than drowning the Katun, we could transfer this power to Altay? And there are other ways as well, after all.

I would like to end with the comment that if we are now making national referendums a regular practice, then it would be good for the first referendum to be on the issue of the existence of nuclear power plants. Thank you. (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: The floor is given to Deputy Vladimir Ivanovich Yarovoy.

V.I. Yarovoy, director of the V.I. Lenin State Union Dvigatel Plant Production Association, Tallinn (Tallinn-Lasnamyaeskiy National- Territorial Election District): Respected comrade deputies! Respected presidium! Sending us off to the congress, our constituents entrusted

us with a mandate of trust, and simultaneously imposed upon us the responsibility for working out a program of action by which to extricate ourselves from the complex economic and political situation which our country has found itself in as a result of the lengthy period of stagnation. Many of the speakers have suggested their own models of solutions to this problem, with every deputy building his model in accordance with his interpretation of the conception of restructuring. Some see the solution to the problem in radical economic reform, while others see the existing bureaucratic apparatus as the root of all evil. Still others lay primary emphasis on sovereignty of the republics. All of these are important, timely issues that require resolution. But I would not be entirely honest and principled if I did not focus, in the name of my constituents, the attention of deputies on the situation in our common home—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the need for protecting it from possible division into individual, isolated national states. After that, none of the suggested models would be possible. Does such a danger really exist, you might ask. Am I looking at the situation too dramatically? No, comrades. I dare to assure you that these are the thoughts of my constituents—laborers of large associations and enterprises contained within the United Council of Estonian Labor Collectives, in which I was elected presidium chairman.

Let's look at how quickly the pressure is falling on the country's political barometer. New regions in which the situation is tense and unstable are appearing all the time. Conflicts are flaring up here and there, chiefly on an ethnic basis. The chorus of voices is becoming louder and more unified as they sing out their ultimatum to the center to reexamine the state structure of the country, the agreement to form the union, the USSR Constitution and other legislative acts regulating relations between republics and the USSR. Even at our congress the chairman of the Lithuanian delegation attempted to organize a *demarche* during discussion of the issue of elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet. Utilizing restructuring as a shield, and confusing democracy with demagoguery, numerous groupings and organizations of an extremist persuasion are operating increasingly more openly and rashly. Having joined together under the banner of a national liberation movement, they are subjecting the indigenous population to mass brainwashing essentially unhindered, striving to sow mistrust among people in the existing structure, the party and government, and to promote enmity in relation to the foreign-language population. But from whom or from what do they wish to liberate themselves? From the dictatorship of central departments and sector ministries? Or in part from their own people speaking a different language? The legislative acts being adopted by the republics and the course of events suggest the latter. Not satisfied with their successes in their own republic, these latter-day missionaries are actively propagandizing their viewpoints and aspirations in many regions of the country. They are carrying on this propaganda here at the congress, in the hotel, and in the streets of the city of Moscow. Powerful pressure is being exerted upon party and state organs and upon the republic's Supreme Soviet, compelling the latter to make concessions even to those in relation to whom firmness is needed. In turn, the perpetual yielding by the leadership and the loss of initiative have led to a situation when restructuring has turned into a one-way street in Estonia, when the majority of the non-Estonian population, which does not support the cult of priority of ethnic groups, now finds itself without a place (Applause).

Legislative activity has begun bearing an increasingly more illegal nature. The republic violated Article 74 of the USSR Constitution for the first time back on 16 November of last year, when a session of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet adopted the well-known amendments to the constitution and the Declaration on Sovereignty. The presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet deemed them to be ineffective, thus giving a negative assessment to such actions. It would have been logical for the republic's leadership to insist on repeal of the unconstitutional articles, but this never occurred. The decision of the presidium was only taken under consideration. A legal conflict arose between the union republic and the union state, one which has not yet been resolved. Moreover, on 18 May of this year this conflict was deepened when a session of the Estonian Supreme Soviet adopted the Law on Principles of Cost Accounting in the Estonian SSR, which is based on the above-mentioned amendments, which goes even farther along the road of rejection of the constitution of the Soviet Union, and which creates an obstacle on the republic's territory to the action of the union labor code, the USSR Law on the State Enterprise, and a number of other legislative acts. A paradoxical situation has evolved, where we, citizens of the Soviet Union, do not know what laws we are living under. Under such conditions can we seriously talk about aspirations for a legal state, which is something that is always declared whenever the republic's government must adopt a particular decision? Can we seriously believe in the assurances of the leadership concerning the socialist nature of the transformations that are occurring, and concerning a desire to develop and fortify the socialist federation, when the reverse is occurring before our eyes—creative unions, social organizations, and voluntary societies of Estonia are tearing their ties with their central organs, and alternative structures are arising? The Pioneer organization has ceased to exist in the republic, the Komsomol is at the brink of dissolution, and the question of making the Estonian Communist Party autonomous is being persistently exaggerated.

Look at how quickly the mass media have restructured themselves. Petty bourgeois ideals and values are being propagandized and exalted with envious scope among the population, and concurrently a disdain for all that is Soviet is being nurtured in the people. I could cite examples of incitement of anti-Soviet and anti-Russian moods. Take for example the article by Kherbert Vayn published in the Tallinn City Party Committee's newspaper VECHERNIY TALLINN on 30 May, literally

right during the work of the congress. Let me read verbatim: "If Stalin (his nationality is of no significance) replaced Lenin's plan for a federation by unitary Russian central power, and if the Russian people allowed him to do this and to proclaim himself to be unique and great throughout all of the Soviet Union, this means that in the eyes of the minorities the responsibility for the distorted Stalinist nationality policy is laid not only upon the Stalinist regime and the regime of stagnation, but also upon the Russian nation. You might not like hearing this, but it is a fact. And if we Communists are made responsible as members of the ruling party for the crimes of Stalinism and for the marching in place during the period of stagnation, irrespective of what our personal role had been, then Russian Communists bear double responsibility for the distorted Stalinist nationality policy." One can find as many articles of this sort as one desires in the last half year.

It is perpetually suggested that Estonia's entry into the Soviet Union was an act of violence and occupation, one which brought misfortune to the Estonian people, who might have been living better today than neighboring Finland. This is why some ideologists of the People's Front are so persistently pressuring Moscow to recognize the pact signed between Molotov and Ribbentrop on 23 August 1939 and the secret protocols attached to it as being ineffective from the moment of their signing. No, such persistence is being displayed not for the sake of restoring historical truth but with the purpose of returning the republic to what it was in 1939. And while this was formerly discussed in whispers, in tiny cafes, in the silence of art studios, now it is being declared loudly enough for all the world to hear.

On 14 May of this year the so-called Baltic Assembly, which was convened in Tallinn with the participation of leaders of the People's Fronts of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, conclusively dispelled the myth behind the true purposes of these movements. And although one of the resolutions addressed to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev offers assurances of adherence to the course of restructuring and expresses support to the Soviet leadership, the main idea is contained in another document, which I cite: "The Baltic Assembly expresses the aspiration of its nations for state sovereignty in a neutral and demilitarized Baltoscandia."

Comrades, why am I saying all of this? Mainly because every deputy present in this hall has felt the real threat upon our federation, and has come to understand that in the person of those who dream of a return to the times of a bourgeois republic we have a serious, well organized force capable of the most extreme steps in the pursuit of its goals. Let me note incidentally that there are among us around 60 national deputies who participated in the proceedings of the Baltic Assembly, and who voted for its resolutions. The CPSU Central Committee and the presidium of the Supreme Soviet are well aware of the development of events in the Baltic countries. However, the numerous appeals of labor collectives, primary party organizations, and individual citizens expressing alarm and concern for the future of Estonia remain without attention. The impression is created that rescue of this sinking ship is being left to the sinking ship itself. Can we say that such a position is correct when we remember the woeful experience of Sumgait, Nagorno-Karabakh, and now Tbilisi and Fergana?

Because my speaking time is limited I am unable to present all facts, materials, and documents confirming the grounds for our alarm over the fate of the Soviet state. Therefore I submit the materials to the presidium and concurrently suggest the following proposal to the congress.

First. To write and adopt, at this very congress, a declaration on the basic principles and stages of reinforcing the Soviet socialist federation, for which purpose a special commission should be formed out of deputies representing all union and autonomous republics, krays and oblasts, and including prominent Soviet scientists and specialists in the area of state and law.

Second. To instruct the USSR Supreme Soviet to write, and submit for national discussion, a draft USSR law on federation concurrently with the text of amendments and supplements to the constitution—the Basic Law. This law should be adopted at the Second Congress of People's Deputies. I feel that it would be suitable to foresee in the bill a provision promoting equalization of the conditions, rights, and real possibilities of the republics, including the RSFSR, ensuring dynamic, comprehensive development of all regions in proportion to their economic potential and population size. The legal status of national minorities residing not in their own national-territorial formations must be clearly documented.

Third. To hasten the writing of draft USSR laws on citizenship and on the problems of delimiting the powers of the USSR and the union republics, reinforcing the legal status of the autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts, and promoting free development and equal utilization of the languages of the peoples of the USSR. The new Supreme Soviet must ensure preferential development of legal acts of unionwide significance providing an opportunity to discuss and coordinate these acts with all union and autonomous republics, krays and oblasts back during the working stage.

Comrade deputies! I would like to state one more idea. Serious debates are proceeding at our congress, criticism is being addressed toward certain individuals, and mistrust is being voiced. This has happened to our respected Chingiz Aytmatov, our president, and the Politburo. I feel that what has been said in relation to Vladimir Ilich Lenin's Mausoleum is blasphemy. However, deputies speaking subsequently restored justice, and we in this hall supported them in unity. I feel that it is both my duty and a demand of my constituents to restore justice in connection with one of the statements made by the deputies in the group from Estonia. This was on 27 May,

when I attempted to gain the floor. Brazen, unproven criticism was addressed at that time at Academician Gustav Naan and the newspaper PRAVDA. We were flooded by messages on this account from our constituents, disturbed by this statement and its suggestion that confrontation is a norm of relations. Restructuring in Estonia, in which confrontation is supposedly not a hindrance to preserving normal relations, was cited as an example of such a norm. Yes, this is in part true. We have not in fact had any direct collisions, there have been no pogroms, there have been no refugees, no tanks, armored personnel carriers, and black berets. But real opposition exists, and growing alienation and mistrust between two large population groups exist. Strike committees demanding aggressive action have been created in our country, and citizen committees demanding secession from the Soviet Union have been created in our country. Voices calling for the creation of an administrative-territorial unit out of northeastern Estonia, in which the majority of the non-Estonian part of the population is concentrated, are being heard in our country with increasingly greater frequency. Is this really what we should be striving for?

This is the other side of the truth, in relation to which the speaker remained silent. Moreover he also remained silent in regard to how confrontation is in fact associated with respect for Gustav Naan, a person, one among a few, who permitted himself to present a scientifically justified position on the demographic situation refuting fabrications concerning the demise of the Estonian nation. Unable to find arguments by which to refute Naan, as if on command the local press began a real hate campaign against the academician, creating about him the halo of an enemy of the Estonian nation. The reaction was soon to follow. The academician was literally inundated by numerous telephone calls, letters, threats, and insults. This is why I take the opportunity to express, from this podium, my disagreement with this statement by one of our deputies, and rise to the defense of Estonian Academician Gustav Naan. (Applause). PRAVDA probably does not need the protection of my constituents. Therefore I am extremely grateful to it, and in the name of my constituents I acknowledge PRAVDA's editor in chief Afanasyev, and the editors in chief of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA, and TRUD as well, for finding the boldness to express on the pages of their newspapers the truth about the events occurring in Estonia.

Comrade deputies! I came up to the podium with only one purpose. It is concerned with the fact that certain people in the republic are not listening to the voice of my constituents, to the voice of the majority of the laborers, to the voice of the majority of the working class that is working in enterprises in the United Council of Labor Collectives, and that they do not wish that the voice of my constituents would be heard from this podium today.

Vladimir Ilich Lenin wrote that there is a need for publishing a statewide law on the basis of which any measure which would grant privileges of any kind to one nation that would disturb the equality of nations or the rights of a national minority would be pronounced illegal, null and void, and any citizen of the state would have the right to demand repeal of such a measure as being unconstitutional, and criminal punishment for those who had begun implementing it. Today, striving to eliminate the distortions in nationality policy which were created in the periods of Stalinism and stagnation in relation to the union republics, we have managed to create distortions in interethnic relations within the republic itself, within the region in an instant, even faster than usual, because we failed to account for the altered demographic situation and the structure of the population. What we are now talking about is not a single person, but tens of thousands of voters, over a hundred thousand who work at enterprises within the Council of Labor Collectives. And if we include their families, then we are talking about hundreds of thousands. This is something we probably will have to reckon with. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

V.I. Yarovoy: Comrade deputies! Respected chairman, I request a minute or so for a point of information...an appeal....

From the floor: (Noise).

V.I. Yarovoy: An appeal of veterans of the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union in the city of Tallinn to the Congress of People's Deputies.

"Respected comrade deputies! It is difficult to communicate the situation of absence of rights, poverty, and humiliation experienced in the Estonian SSR by hundreds of families of Armed Forces veterans discharged into the reserves. For years on end we have been deprived of housing and of the right to travel to our selected place of residence, contrary to existing union and republic legislative acts. Our appeals to all levels of authority in local government organs demanding compliance with the law in the provision of housing to us have been unfruitful. We are forced to note that complaints submitted to the presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet on 4 January and 18 April 1989 and to the USSR Procuracy on 28 March 1989 have also been unable to produce any results. These complaints were returned to republic organs. In our opinion such a method of solving the problems only encourages republic government organs to ignore union legislative acts that have become entrenched in the practice of the Estonian SSR, and equally so, the rights and needs of Armed Forces veterans.

"Under these conditions, Armed Forces veterans who had devoted their lives to the defense of the motherland have found themselves in their declining years without a nook and a roof over their heads, without social rights and protections. We feel that we do not deserve such treatment. Armed Forces veterans wholly support

restructuring being implemented by the CPSU and the Soviet people, and they are taking part in the society's renewal within the bounds of their capabilities.

"At the same time we are certain that the more frequently violations of the existing laws are tolerated, the more difficult it will be for our society to travel the path of restructuring, and the greater the losses will be.

"A general meeting of Armed Forces veterans of the city of Tallinn instructs the people's deputies from the Estonian SSR, Comrades Yarovoy and Kogan, to present this appeal to the congress and submit the text of the appeal to the constitutional watchdog committee to be created.

"Acting in behalf of the general meeting of veterans of the city of Tallinn held 27 May, Veterans' Council Chairman Captain 1st Rank Ratsis and secretary Captain Felivovich."

Thank you. (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: Comrades, we have around 10 minutes left for points of information. Many comrades have signed up here, but I think that we should begin examining these statements without losing time, or comrades will simply begin leaving the hall.

The floor is given first to Comrade Vitaliy Iosifovich Goldanskiy. Mukhtar Shakhanov will be next.

I ask as a big favor that the statements be limited to 2 minutes if possible.

V.I. Goldanskiy, director of the N.N. Semenov Institute of Chemical Physics of the USSR Academy of Sciences, chairman of the Soviet Paguoshskiy Committee, Moscow (from the Soviet Peace Fund jointly with eight Soviet committees for peace, solidarity, and international cooperation): I will try to keep it down to three.

A.V. Gorbunov: Three—otherwise we'll not get anything done here.

V.I. Goldanskiy: Comrades, I sought the floor in accordance with the procedures for conducting this session of the congress. According to the rules I should have 3 minutes. I will try to fit my statement into less.

Dear comrade deputies, there is no doubt, and it is universally recognized, that our restructuring has produced tangible positive results for the moment only in the sociopolitical sphere. Chiefly in international relations, in foreign policy.

The successes of our foreign policy are based on the main thesis of the new way of political thinking—priority of human values over all others. But this is at the foundation. What has also played an extremely important practical role is the fact that in recent years our foreign policy has acquired a number of properties, a number of qualities that were totally alien to it before.

Here are these properties, these qualities. First. The ability to hear out the arguments of the other side, even if they are totally divergent from one's own opinion.

Second. The ability to persuade the other side as to the righteousness of one's own arguments. And I mean persuade, rather than resorting to force.

Third. The ability to seek and find mutually acceptable solutions to disputed issues, to strive for consensus and unanimity in the name of constructive effort.

These qualities are necessary attributes of international relations in a civilized world. But all of these qualities are just as mandatory in all mutual relations between civilized people.

In particular, they are an indispensible prerequisite of normal activities of deputies. And consequently as a minimum we must hear each other out, and respect the right of each deputy to possess and state his own opinion. Neither the majority nor the minority possesses a monopoly on the truth. In the Bible, it was the majority that shouted "Crucify Him!". Half a century ago a majority in our country wrathfully demanded the heads of innocents judged by outrageous kangaroo courts. It is easier of course for a majority to outshout a minority. Though a minority can also sometimes be rather loud.

This is precisely why we must persuade and not outshout one another. We have clearly not yet learned to do so. And the whole world has become witness to our intolerance of the opinions of others, the hissing, the shouts, the clapping, something very close to foot-stamping, and the occasional personal insults voiced in this hall. Through such actions we diminish our authority as deputies and the authority of the entire congress.

Much of course depends on the session chairmen, but it is all in our hands, after all, and we are all responsible for this. And in order to better guarantee that our debates would be constructive, I propose writing rules of behavior and submitting them to the congress for a vote so that we would be sure to observe them. (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: The floor is given to Comrade Mukhtar Shakhanov. Comrade Arkadiy Pavlovich Aydak will speak next.

M. Shakhanov, writer, editor in chief of the journal ZHALYN, secretary of the board of the Kazakh SSR Writers Union, Alma-Ata (Alma-Ata-Talgar Territorial-Election District): Exalted congress! I would like to present the following statement in behalf of the 19 USSR people's deputies of Kazakhstan in an effort to avoid new outbursts of international discord, considering the acute situation that has evolved in the republic.

After the issue as to the events in Georgia was raised at the congress, the group of delegates from Kazakhstan received a mass of telegrams and group letters from their constituents. They are displeased by the fact that even in the presence of such glasnost and openness at the congress we have not raised the issue as to the events that occurred in Alma-Ata in December 1986, when sapper's shovels and police dogs were used against peaceful demonstrators for the first time in the country, and young girls were beaten with clubs and kicked with tarpaulin boots. All of this happened in a time before the existence of the commonly known ukase on demonstrations and rallies. The number of victims among the demonstrators is still being concealed from the public. According to incomplete data around 2,000 persons were arrested. Many of them were sentenced to lengthy prison terms. Thousands were expelled from educational institutions, and fired from their jobs.

In response to the first attack upon it, the era of stagnation has bared its teeth with a vengeance, causing misfortune to hundreds of politically unprepared young men and women whose lives have been forever shattered.

For the sake of justice it must be noted that the republic's party organization, headed by the noted international figure of Comrade Kolbin, devoted considerable effort to improving the situation. However, the truth about the events in Alma-Ata and about the unlawful actions by soldiers of the internal troops still remains classified. This is why various unhealthy rumors are circulating in our country, casting a shadow upon the friendship of peoples and acting as a source of some national enmity.

In this connection we make a strong plea for the creation of a commission out of people's deputies representing different regions and nationalities in order to clarify the real truth about the December events in Alma-Ata.

After the events described above, the CPSU Central Committee published the decree "On the Work of the Kazakh Republic Party Organization on International and Patriotic Education of Laborers." In this decree the event was called a manifestation of Kazakh nationalism. We could accuse five thousand people, ten thousand or one hundred thousand, but we cannot accuse all of the Kazakh people of nationalism. The term "Kazakh nationalism" is an accusation of all of the Kazakh people. Therefore we request that justice be established, and that the severe and undeserved accusations against the people be withdrawn.

The Kazakh people have demonstrated their faithfulness to the friendship of peoples many times by their history and with their blood. A CPSU Central Committee plenum on interethnic problems will soon be held. Many interested people's deputies will not be able to participate in this forum, since they are not members of the Central Committee. Therefore the group of Kazakh deputies proposes that we should adopt a decree prior to the plenum, and precisely during our congress, on the status of the state language of the indigenous nationality of union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, national okrugs and minorities, and resolve the very acute questions as to the destiny of Soviet Turks and Crimean Tatars, who to this date feel themselves to be exiles from their own country.

Allow me to communicate to the presidium some of the demands of the voters, including letters to the congress signed by known writers, scientists, and young people in the republic. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: Arkadiy Pavlovich Aydak now has the floor, and Comrade Plotnikov will speak next.

A.P. Aydak, chairman of the Leninskaya Iskra Collective Farm [kolkhoz], Yadrinskiy Rayon (Yadrinskiy National-Territorial Election District, Chuvash ASSR): I have 3 minutes. Dear comrades! The tragedy in the Bashkir ASSR affects us all, since after all, we are brothers in a single family. Our kolkhoz will donate R5,000 in aid of the victims.

To go on, here is the first thing I wish to say. Food is still the main problem today. Therefore I think that the floor should be given to agrarian deputies to a greater extent than previously. I am certain that the acuity of the problems that have been discussed so much at the congress will decrease if the food situation improves.

Second. After the appeal of the 417 deputies was read to the congress, the chairman announced that creation of a committee on agrarian issues—one of the principal ideas of the appeal—needed to be postponed to the autumn session. Last Friday [2 June] 270 agrarian deputies decided at a meeting, and I am speaking at their instruction, that we need to create a committee on agrarian issues under the Supreme Soviet—prior to the conclusion of the congress work at that—and not a food commission under the Soviet of the Union. On Saturday the Soviet of the Elders was able to decide positively on the creation of precisely this committee, but when I asked the Soviet of the Elders if the rights of the committee would be as stated in the appeal, no guarantee was offered. In this connection I would like to say the following.

In order that creation of the committee would not degenerate into just another formality, we need to adopt the appeal of the 417 at this very congress as a decision of the congress on agrarian issues. This means that we ourselves, the agrarian deputies, will elect the committee with all of the rights stated in the appeal. This will serve as material fulfillment of Lenin's commandment: "Do not dare to command the peasant." (Applause).

May I speak for another minute?

A.V. Gorbunov: Arkadiy Pavlovich, you requested time for a point of information, for a short statement.

A.P. Aydak: That's all I have. I am reaching the end. Our requests to assemble agrarian deputies for meetings are not being announced, except in one case—by Mikhail Sergeyevich—in contrast to the meetings of deputies representing other sectors. Moreover we even have to beg persistently for a microphone to use at the meetings. Here as well, we should not treat peasants as second-rate people, as it is stated in the appeal of the 417.

Mikhail Sergeyevich, we voted for you, and we share with you the responsibility for solving the food problem. Therefore we ask that you heed our opinion. Thank you. (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: The last to speak in the "points of information" phase is Comrade Andrey Leonidovich Plotnikov.

A.L. Plotnikov, foreman of the Kirovo-Chepetsk Mechanical Repair Plant, Kirov Oblast (from the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League): Respected comrade chairman, comrade deputies! As I see it, very soon the Supreme Soviet will have to resolve an important issue concerning the staffing of permanent commissions and committees. During the congress we have already witnessed the loss of a number of candidates during elections to the Soviet of the Union.

Besides the name of Yuriy Chemodanov so painfully familiar to all of us today, which has already disappeared from the secret ballot, the opinions of oblast delegations concerning the candidacy of our young deputies Tsigelnikov and Uvarov were ignored when the list of candidates was being drawn up. Even at this moment certain changes are still being made in this picture. We find that in staffing the Youth Affairs Committee, once again the names of a number of deputies have disappeared—particularly those of Gubin and Minin. This might be a coincidence, but I would prefer to avoid such coincidences, all the more so because in filling out the questionnaire on commissions and committees, a large number of deputies signed up for several of them together—that is, what is operating here is the duplication principle, which is in no way acceptable in the resolution of such important matters.

Comrade deputies, I am certain that none of you have any doubts that tomorrow, after the question of the staffing of the committees is resolved in a joint meeting of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, debates will necessarily arise over minor procedural matters. In order to avoid them, we suggest what is from our point of view a clear procedure for forming the personnel composition of the committees, which would be the prerogative of the congress. I emphasize—of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, since in accordance with the constitution, these committees will be staffed not only by members of the Supreme Soviet but also by other USSR people's deputies.

Now I will dare to propose that if this matter is not resolved promptly, mistakes will subsequently arise similar to those made during the elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Comrades, we can and must learn from our own errors, but we must at least strive to not repeat these errors later on. They cost us too dearly. I have in my hands a draft resolution of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies drawn up by a group of deputies from the Komsomol on the procedures for staffing the committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet. In compliance with the provisionary regulations of the congress the proposed draft must be duplicated –that is my opinion, since it was signed by 20 deputies—and distributed to all deputies for detailed examination. If necessary, we can create a working group on this issue right now, in order to discuss the draft resolution and adopt it at the very next session of the congress.

In conclusion I would like to express the hope that the proposed variant for staffing our working organs is acceptable to the deputies to the congress, that it will be approved by them, and that it will produce doubtless benefit by excluding unrelated issues and complaints and thus conserving the precious time of USSR people's deputies. Thank you. (Applause).

A.V. Gorbunov: Comrades, anyone else who....

Ye.A. Gayer, scientific associate of the Institute of History, Archeology, and Ethnography of the Far Eastern Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Vladivostok (Far Eastern National-Territorial Election District, RSFSR): One minute, please.

M.S. Gorbachev: Oh, let her speak.

From the floor: Yes, let her speak, of course.

A.V. Gorbunov: One minute, please, you asked for one minute.

Ye.A. Gayer: Dear comrades, I want to know by what grounds I have been deprived of gaining the floor. The Soviet of Nationalities will meet after lunch, and the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities will meet jointly tomorrow. When am I going to be able to speak?

A.V. Gorbunov: You will speak at the next general meeting.

Ye.A. Gayer: There is something else I wish to say. Dear comrades, it was after last Friday that the terrible tragedy which threw our congress off schedule occurred in our country. It was Friday evening, as we recall, after our congress concluded its work. I would like to say something concerning the contempt that was voiced in the name of all the people publicly toward Academician Sakharov. On what basis can one person say that he

speaks for all the people? I have telegrams, a pile of telegrams from the Far East, in which people ask me to extend support, respect, and admiration to Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov. (Tumultuous applause). Here is what I would like to say.... Please hold the applause!

A.V. Gorbunov: Excuse me, allow me to speak to you as well. You asked for one minute....

Ye.A. Gayer: It took me that much time just to get up to the podium. I will now speak.

A.V. Gorbunov: Respected colleague, I deny you the floor. You asked for one minute, and I have to keep the congress moving. I am showing you the red card. You are still among the speakers. Thank you. (Applause).

Comrades! I now have a very brief but very important announcement. It has been proposed that all of us now go and pay our respects to Lenin and lay wreaths on behalf of our congress at Vladimir Ilich Lenin's mausoleum and at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. (Applause).

It is proposed that we lay the wreaths now, right after the conclusion of our meeting. USSR people's deputies may convene at Red Square, by the mausoleum, at 1420. There is enough time. Exit through Spasskiy and Nikolskiy gates.

Now very briefly about our subsequent work:

First: Today at 1600 the first organizational meeting of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet will be held in the chamber meeting hall.

Second: Tomorrow at 1000 the first joint meeting of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet is to be held there as well.

The editorial commission asks those deputies who will not participate in the meeting of the Soviet of Nationalities to convene at 1600 in the Hall of Mirrors.

Excuse me, but there is one more announcement: The commission on the events in Tbilisi will convene in the presidium room, here, at 1530.

Our next meeting, a general meeting of the congress, will be held here tomorrow at 1600. So, until that time, a recess of the general meeting is announced.